

to increased cost of production under such conditions. This would mean that in 1938 malaria in foreign countries cost the United States \$175,000,000. Today it is probably more. That is a huge sum in comparison with what we are now spending on health improvement outside our own country.

During the current year the United States will pay a little over 38 percent of the budget of the World Health Organization which reaches the ceiling figure of \$1,920,000 at present authorized by the Congress. The Second World Health Assembly increased the budget from \$5,000,000 to \$7,000,000, but reduced at the same time the contribution of the United States to 36 percent. It was accepted that our contribution should be reduced to one-third in subsequent years, that present reduction being the first step.

I have been speaking of the reduction of preventable disease only in terms of economics and as an excellent investment. What of the anguish and suffering when, on the average, one member of every family in the more backward half of the world is ill at all times? What of the fear of death when, as in India, the expectation of life at birth is only 27 years? With us it is now approaching the three score and ten: Freedom from preventable disease can be bought and the price has been going down rapidly during the last few years. That freedom is necessary if people are to acquire and maintain the other four freedoms. I earnestly urge continuing and increasing support of this great work.

#### INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1950

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3838) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, there are a few amendments concerning which there is no controversy, and which can be acted upon now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the first committee amendment, on page 2, line 17.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 7, after the word "binding", to strike out "\$325,000" and insert "\$370,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 22, after the word "including", to strike out "\$107,000" and insert "\$115,000"; on page 4, line 1, after the word "aircraft", to strike out "\$2,600,000" and insert "\$2,800,000"; and in line 7, after the word "Interior," to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "Provided further, That not to exceed \$65,000 of the unobligated balance of the appropriation for this purpose contained in the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1949, is hereby continued available to June 30, 1950."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, after line 9, to strike out:

Salaries and expenses, southeastern power marketing: For expenses necessary to carry

out the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (16 U. S. C. 825a), as applied to the area east of the Mississippi River, for marketing power produced or to be produced at multiple-purpose projects of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army; purchase (not to exceed two) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and printing and binding, \$70,000.

#### RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. HAYDEN. That amendment may cause some controversy.

I therefore move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his motion for a moment?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I have just returned to the Senate Chamber, and I ask what committee amendment is now pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment on page 5, line 10.

Mr. WHERRY. And have the previous committee amendments been agreed to?

Mr. HAYDEN. I will say to the Senator that the committee amendments up to that point have been agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for expediting the consideration of the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. I now renew my motion that the Senate take a recess.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, August 15, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 12 (legislative day of June 2), 1949:

##### MUNITIONS BOARD

Carl A. Ilgenfritz, of Pennsylvania, to be Chairman of the Munitions Board.

##### CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES ARMY

Gen. Joseph Lawton Collins, United States Army, for appointment as Chief of Staff, United States Army.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 12 (legislative day of June 2), 1949:

##### DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Philip M. Kaiser to be Assistant Secretary of Labor.

##### THE TAX COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Miss Marion J. Harron to be judge of the Tax Court of the United States, for a term of 12 years from June 2, 1948.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, AUGUST 12, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Acting Chaplain, the Reverend James P. Wesberry, pastor, Morningside Baptist Church, Atlanta, Ga., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hast made of one blood all the nations that dwell upon the earth, deliver us, we entreat Thee, from in-

tolerance, selfishness, and unkindness. Make us friendly with those with whom we do not always agree and who do not always agree with us. Give us magnanimity of soul that transcends all barriers of race, color, and creed. As we would that men should do unto us, may we likewise do unto them. Imbue us, Holy Father, Lord of heaven and of earth, with the spirit of Christ who taught us to love our enemies, to bless them that curse us, to do good to them that hate us, and to pray for them which despitefully use us and persecute us, that we may be the children of our Father which is in heaven, for Thou makest the sun to shine on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust. In our blessed Saviour's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 153):

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives be, and it is hereby, requested to return to the Senate the bill (S. 51) to amend title 28, United States Code, section 962, so as to authorize reimbursement for official travel by privately owned automobiles by officers and employees of the courts of the United States and of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts at a rate not exceeding 7 cents per mile.

#### COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WILSON of Texas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

#### INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION ACT, 1950—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House conferees on the bill (H. R. 4177) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELLIOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CAVALCANTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the

RECORD in two instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mrs. BOSONE asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD and include a speech on the mining industry by J. C. Jensen.

Mr. FLOOD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in three instances.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a news item from London, England, on mental hospitals.

Mr. VELDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Peoria Star of August 9, 1949, with reference to the recent statement of the State Department on China.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. SMITH of Kansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances; in one to include an editorial and in the other a letter.

#### BRITISH-AMERICAN SWAGGER STICKS

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it has been most interesting to learn in the last few days that staff officers of the United States Army are to be equipped with that great British weapon of war, the swagger stick.

We are told that these swagger sticks are now receiving their finishing touches in the Fort Belvoir paint shop; that each of these sticks, three-eighths inch in diameter and 24 inches in length, requires 10 hours of labor in the paint shop alone.

Who is paying for this labor? You can be sure it is the taxpayers and not the Army officers.

A swagger stick as part of the equipment of an American Army officer is about as necessary as feathers on a bullfrog, and since when did it become necessary that our military men ape the snobbery of the British officer caste system of which this device is a symbol?

I suggest that Secretary of Defense Johnson lose no time in borrowing one of those 5-percent refrigeration units and put this entire nauseating swagger stick business in deep freeze. He might also give consideration to putting Major General Weart, the author of this latest boondoggling, in with the sticks.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and the conclusion of special orders heretofore granted, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FARRINGTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the New York Times.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order to inquire of the majority leader as to the program for today and next week also, if he can announce it at this time.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the first order of business today will be the conference report on the bill, S. 1962, relating to cotton-acreage allotments and marketing quotas. Whether or not the independent offices appropriation bill will be ready to report, I am not able to state.

The SPEAKER. The chairman of the subcommittee just asked permission to have until midnight to file the report.

Mr. McCORMACK. That answers that.

The next order of business will be the lobby investigation. Then, there is House Joint Resolution 312, relating to the Haiti Bicentennial, which will follow.

Then the bill relieving the President of certain work, to the extent that we can.

That will be the order of business, to the extent we can go. It is my intention, unless something unexpected arises, of which we are not advised, to adjourn over from today until Monday.

Mr. HALLECK. Can the gentleman inform us as to the program for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. On Monday the Consent Calendar will be called. There will be the following suspensions:

H. R. 799, the Weber Basin reclamation project.

S. 855, the Alaska Public Works Act. House Joint Resolution 87, payments of Finland.

H. R. 2734, monopolies and unlawful restraints.

There is one bill relating to agricultural workers from foreign countries, H. R. 5557. A rule has been reported out on that.

Of course, conference reports will be in order at any time, and, if a rule is reported out on it, the Korea aid bill will be brought up. Then, if the bill is reported from the Committee on Foreign Affairs with reference to military assistance, and a rule is granted, of course that will be brought up.

I am unable to make any statement beyond that. It is all uncertain. It all depends more or less on what arises from time to time.

I am perfectly frank to say that everything was done by the leadership on both

sides to get the military-assistance bill out of the committee. I was hopeful that if that had been accomplished, we would be in a position to take action that would be pleasing to the House, and I think the House would be anxious to take that action.

However, that is the situation. Those bills did not come out. As soon as possible, the leadership will bring them up.

I would like to announce further that the fourth deficiency appropriation bill will come up next week. The chairman of the committee informed me that it will be ready on Tuesday.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has expired.

#### TRANSPORTATION OF PASSENGERS AND MERCHANDISE ON CANADIAN VESSELS IN ALASKA

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN], chairman of the subcommittee, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2634) to provide transportation of passengers and merchandise on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation, with Senate amendments, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, lines 7 and 8, strike out "and merchandise."

Page 2, line 5, after "transportation", insert: "Provided, That such Canadian vessels may transport merchandise between Hyder, Alaska, and other ports and points herein enumerated."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to be informed as to what these amendments are and what this is all about.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, the bill as it passed the House recently provided that Canadian steamships could carry passengers and merchandise to three ports in Alaska.

One of those ports is served only by a small American mail boat and otherwise can be served only by Canadian shipping.

With reference to the other two ports the American service has been quite infrequent. The Senate amendment provided that passengers and merchandise could be carried to the one port where there is altogether inadequate American service, Hyder; but with reference to Haines and Skagway in southeastern Alaska the Senate amendment provided



that the ships could carry only passengers. In other words, the effect of the Senate amendment was to strike the word "merchandise" from carriage on the part of Canadian ships to Haines and Skagway.

Mr. SABATH. As a matter of fact, the American companies were objecting to giving the Canadian companies the right to operate in Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. I may say that the American shipping company does not object to the form of the bill as it is now before the House; it is perfectly agreeable to having the Canadian shipping companies carry passengers to Haines and Skagway, and passengers and merchandise to Hyder.

Mr. SABATH. That is to one point.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is to one point for passengers, and merchandise and passengers to the other two.

Mr. SABATH. And the American companies have agreed to that?

Mr. BARTLETT. The American company has agreed to that.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, Haines and Skagway are both on the Lynn Canal, are they not?

Mr. BARTLETT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. How far apart are they, approximately?

Mr. BARTLETT. Sixteen miles.

Mr. RANKIN. And the only possible way for American transportation to reach either Haines or Skagway is by boat, is it not?

Mr. BARTLETT. For all practical purposes; yes. Passengers and merchandise could, of course, be shipped over the Alaska Highway to Whitehorse, and thence by railroad to Skagway, but that would be very involved and difficult.

Mr. RANKIN. In order to get American goods into either Haines or Skagway at reasonable rates they have to come by boat?

Mr. BARTLETT. For all practical purposes; yes.

Mr. RANKIN. That is what I mean, for all practical purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

#### COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have until midnight Saturday to file a report.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is that on the arms program bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. That is what the understanding is.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. To that I object. The gentleman knows my views about that bill. I will have to object.

#### COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight Saturday to file reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include a bill which he introduced yesterday to restore the 16,000 veterans' hospital beds that were eliminated some time ago.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two separate instances and in each to include extraneous matter.

#### COTTON AND WHEAT MARKETING QUOTAS

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1962) to amend the cotton and wheat marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and ask unanimous consent that the Statement of the Managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement follow:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 1259)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1962) to amend the cotton and wheat marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That sections 342 to 350, inclusive, of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

#### "NATIONAL MARKETING QUOTA

"SEC. 342. Whenever during any calendar year the Secretary determines that the total supply of cotton for the marketing year beginning in such calendar year will exceed the normal supply for such marketing year, the Secretary shall proclaim such fact and a national marketing quota shall be in effect for the crop of cotton produced in the next calendar year. The Secretary shall also determine and specify in such proclamation the amount of the national marketing quota in terms of the number of bales of cotton (standard bales of five hundred pounds gross weight) adequate, together with (1) the estimated carry-over at the beginning of the marketing year which begins in the next calendar year and (2) the estimated imports during such marketing year, to make available a normal supply of cotton. The national marketing quota for any year shall be not less than ten million bales or one million bales less than the estimated domestic consumption plus exports of cotton for the marketing year ending in the calendar year in which such quota is proclaimed, whichever is smaller: *Provided*, That the national mar-

keting quota for 1950 shall be not less than the number of bales required to provide a national acreage allotment of twenty-one million acres. Such proclamation shall be made not later than October 15 of the calendar year in which such determination is made.

#### "REFERENDUM

"SEC. 343. Not later than December 15 following the issuance of the marketing quota proclamation provided for in section 342, the Secretary shall conduct a referendum, by secret ballot, of farmers engaged in the production of cotton in the calendar year in which the referendum is held, to determine whether such farmers are in favor of or opposed to the quota so proclaimed: *Provided*, That if marketing quotas are proclaimed for the 1950 crop, farmers eligible to vote in the referendum held with respect to such crop shall be those farmers who were engaged in the production of cotton in the calendar year of 1948. If more than one-third of the farmers voting in the referendum oppose the national marketing quota, such quota shall become ineffective upon proclamation of the results of the referendum. The Secretary shall proclaim the results of any referendum held hereunder within thirty days after the date of such referendum.

#### "ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

"SEC. 344. (a) Whenever a national marketing quota is proclaimed under section 342, the Secretary shall determine and proclaim a national acreage allotment for the crop of cotton to be produced in the next calendar year. The national acreage allotment for cotton shall be that acreage, based upon the national average yield per acre of cotton for the five years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the national marketing quota is proclaimed, required to make available from such crop an amount of cotton equal to the national marketing quota.

"(b) The national acreage allotment for cotton for 1953 and subsequent years shall be apportioned to the States on the basis of the acreage planted to cotton (including the acreage regarded as having been planted to cotton under the provisions of Public Law 12, Seventy-ninth Congress) during the five calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the national marketing quota is proclaimed, with adjustments for abnormal weather conditions during such period.

"(c) The national acreage allotments for cotton for the years 1950 and 1951 shall be apportioned to the States on the basis of a national acreage allotment base of twenty-two million five hundred thousand acres, computed and adjusted as follows:

"(1) The average of the planted acreages (including acreage regarded as planted under the provisions of Public Law 12, Seventy-ninth Congress) in the States for the years 1945, 1946, 1947, and 1948 shall constitute the national base; except that in the case of any State having a 1948 planted cotton acreage of over one million acres and less than 50 per centum of the 1943 allotment, the average of the acreage planted (or regarded as planted under Public Law 12, Seventy-ninth Congress) for the years 1944, 1945, 1946, 1947, and 1948 shall constitute the base for such State and shall be included in computing the national base; to this is to be added (A) the estimated additional acreage for each State required for small-farm allotments under subsection (f) (1) of this section; (B) the acreage required as a result of the State adjustment provisions of paragraph (2) of this subsection; (C) the additional acreage required to determine a total national allotment base of twenty-two million five hundred thousand acres, which additional acreage shall be distributed on a proportionate basis among States receiving no adjustment under paragraph (2) of this subsection.

"(2) Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection, the acreage allotment base for 1950 and 1951 for any State (on the basis of a national acreage allotment base of twenty-two million five hundred thousand acres) shall not be less than the larger of (1) 95 per centum of the average acreage actually planted to cotton in the State during the years 1947 and 1948, or (2) 85 per centum of the acreage planted to cotton in the State in 1948.

"(3) If the national acreage allotment for 1950 or 1951 is more or less than twenty-two million five hundred thousand acres, horizontal adjustments shall be made percentage-wise by States so as to reflect the ratio of the national acreage allotment for 1950 and 1951 to twenty-two million five hundred thousand acres.

"(d) The national acreage allotment for cotton for 1952 shall be apportioned to States on the basis of the acreage planted to cotton (including the acreage regarded as having been planted to cotton under the provisions of Public Law 12, Seventy-ninth Congress) during the years 1946, 1947, 1948, and 1950, with adjustments for abnormal weather conditions during such period.

"(e) The State acreage allotment for cotton shall be apportioned to counties on the same basis as to years and conditions as is applicable to the State under subsections (b), (c), and (d) of this section: *Provided*, That the State committee may reserve not to exceed 10 per centum of its State acreage allotment (15 per centum if the State's 1948 planted acreage was in excess of one million acres and less than half its 1943 allotment) which shall be used to make adjustments in county allotments for trends in acreage, for counties adversely affected by abnormal conditions affecting plantings, or for small or new farms.

"(f) The county acreage allotment, less not to exceed the percentage provided for in paragraph 3 of this subsection, shall be apportioned to farms on which cotton has been planted (or regarded as having been planted under the provisions of Public Law 12, Seventy-ninth Congress) in any one of the three years immediately preceding the year for which such allotment is determined on the following basis:

"(1) There shall be allotted the smaller of the following: (A) five acres; or (B) the highest number of acres planted (or regarded as planted under Public Law 12, Seventy-ninth Congress) to cotton in any year of such three-year period.

"(2) The remainder shall be allotted to farms other than farms to which an allotment has been made under paragraph (1) (B) so that the allotment to each farm under this paragraph together with the amount of the allotment to such farm under paragraph (1) (A) shall be a prescribed percentage (which percentage shall be the same for all such farms in the county or administrative area) of the acreage, during the preceding year, on the farm which is tilled annually or in regular rotation, excluding from such acreages the acres devoted to the production of sugarcane for sugar; sugar beets for sugar; wheat, tobacco, or rice for market; peanuts picked and threshed; wheat or rice for feeding to livestock for market; or lands determined to be devoted primarily to orchards or vineyards, and nonirrigated lands in irrigated areas: *Provided, however*, That if a farm would be allotted under this paragraph an acreage together with the amount of the allotment to such farm under paragraph (1) (A) in excess of the largest acreage planted (and regarded as planted under Public Law 12, Seventy-ninth Congress) to cotton during any of the preceding three years, the acreage allotment for such farm shall not exceed such largest acreage so planted (and regarded as planted under Public Law 12, Seventy-ninth Congress) in any such year.

"(3) The county committee may reserve not in excess of 10 per centum of the county allotment (15 per centum if the State's 1948 planted cotton acreage was in excess of one million acres and less than half its 1943 allotment) which, in addition to the acreage made available under the proviso in subsection (e), shall be used for (A) establishing allotments for farms on which cotton was not planted (or regarded as planted under Public Law 12, Seventy-ninth Congress) during any of the three calendar years immediately preceding the year for which the allotment is made, on the basis of land, labor, and equipment available for the production of cotton, crop-rotation practices, and the soil and other physical facilities affecting the production of cotton; and (B) making adjustments of the farm acreage allotments established under paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection so as to establish allotments which are fair and reasonable in relation to the factors set forth in this paragraph and abnormal conditions of production on such farms: *Provided*, That not less than 30 per centum of the acreage reserved under this subsection shall, to the extent required, be allotted, upon such basis as the Secretary deems fair and reasonable to farms (other than farms to which an allotment has been made under subsection (f) (1) (B)), if any, to which an allotment of not exceeding fifteen acres may be made under other provisions of this subsection.

"(g) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section—

"(1) State, county, and farm acreage allotments and yields for cotton shall be established in conformity with Public Law 28, Eighty-first Congress.

"(2) In apportioning the county allotment among the farms within the county, the Secretary, through the local committees, shall take into consideration different conditions within separate administrative areas within a county if any exist, including types, kinds, and productivity of the soil so as to prevent discrimination among the administrative areas of the county.

"(3) For any farm on which the acreage planted to cotton in any year is less than the farm acreage allotment for such year by not more than the larger of 10 per centum of the allotment or one acre, an acreage equal to the farm acreage allotment shall be deemed to be the acreage planted to cotton on such farm, and the additional acreage added to the cotton acreage history for the farm shall be added to the cotton acreage history for the county and State.

"(h) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the county committee, upon application by the owner or operator of the farm, (1) may establish an allotment for any cotton farm acquired in 1940 or thereafter for nonfarming purposes by the United States or any State or agency thereof which has been returned to agricultural production but which is not eligible for an allotment under paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (f) of this section, and (2) shall establish an allotment for any farm within the State owned or operated by the person from whom a cotton farm was acquired in such State in 1940 or thereafter for a governmental or other public purpose: *Provided*, That no allotment shall be established for any such farm unless application therefor is filed within three years after acquisition of such farm by the applicant or within three years after the enactment of this Act, whichever period is longer: *And provided further*, That no person shall be entitled to receive an allotment under both (1) and (2) of this subsection. The allotment so made for any such farm shall compare with the allotments established for other farms in the same area which are similar, taking into consideration the acreage allotment, if any, of the farm so acquired, the land, labor, and equipment available for

the production of cotton, crop rotation practices, and the soil and other physical facilities affecting the production of cotton. Except to the extent that the production on any such farm has contributed to the county and State allotments, any allotment established pursuant to this subsection shall be in addition to the acreage allotments otherwise established for the county and State under this Act, and the production from the additional acreage so allotted shall be in addition to the national marketing quota.

"(i) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, any acreage planted to cotton in excess of the farm acreage allotment shall not be taken into account in establishing State, county, and farm acreage allotments.

"(j) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, State and county committees shall make available for inspection by owners or operators of farms receiving cotton acreage allotments all records pertaining to cotton acreage allotments and marketing quotas.

"(k) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section except subsection (g) (1), there shall be allotted to each State for which an allotment is made under this section not less than the smaller of (A) four thousand acres or (B) the highest acreage planted to cotton in any one of the three calendar years immediately preceding the year for which the allotment is made.

"(l) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary, in administering the provisions of Public Law 12, Seventy-ninth Congress, as it relates to war crops, shall carry out the provisions of such Act in the following manner:

"(i) A survey shall be conducted of every farm which had a 1942 cotton acreage allotment, and of such other farms as the Secretary considers necessary in the administration of Public Law 12. This survey shall obtain for each farm the most accurate information possible on (a) the total acreage in cultivation, and (b) the acreage of individual crops planted on each farm in the years 1941, 1945, 1946, and 1947.

"(ii) An eligible farm for war-crop credit shall be a farm on which (a) the cotton acreage on the farm in 1945, 1946, or 1947, was reduced below the cotton acreage planted on the farm in 1941; (b) the war-crop acreage on the farm in 1945, 1946, or 1947, was increased above the war-crop acreage on the farm in 1941; and (c) the farm had a cotton acreage allotment in 1942.

"(iii) A farm shall be regarded as having planted cotton (in addition to the actual acreage planted to cotton) to the extent of the lesser of (a) the reduction in cotton acreage for each of the years 1945, 1946, and 1947, below the acreage planted to cotton in 1941, or (b) the increase in war crops for each of the years 1945, 1946, and 1947, above that planted to such war crops in 1941. However, the county committee may be given the discretion to adjust such war-crop credit when the county committee determines that the reduction in cotton acreage was not related to an increase in war crops, but the adjustment shall be made only after consultation with the producer.

"(iv) The Secretary, using the best information obtainable, and working with and through the State and county committees, shall use whatever means necessary to make an accurate determination of the credits due each individual farm, under Public Law 12.

"(v) The total of the war-crop credits due the individual farms in each county shall be credited to the county and the total of the war-crop credits due all of the counties in a State shall be credited to the State.

"(vi) The acreage credited to States, counties, and farms for the years 1945, 1946, or 1947, because of war crops, shall be taken into full account in the determination and distribution of cotton acreage allotments on a national, State, county, and farm basis.



#### "FARM MARKETING QUOTAS"

"SEC. 345. The farm marketing quota for any crop of cotton shall be the actual production of the acreage planted to cotton on the farm less the farm marketing excess. The farm marketing excess shall be the normal production of that acreage planted to cotton on the farm which is in excess of the farm acreage allotment: *Provided*, That such farm marketing excess shall not be larger than the amount by which the actual production of cotton on the farm exceeds the normal production of the farm acreage allotment, if the producer establishes such actual production to the satisfaction of the Secretary.

#### "PENALTIES"

"SEC. 346. (a) Whenever farm marketing quotas are in effect with respect to any crop of cotton, the producer shall be subject to a penalty on the farm marketing excess at a rate per pound equal to 50 per centum of the parity price per pound for cotton as of June 15 of the calendar year in which such crop is produced.

"(b) The farm marketing excess of cotton shall be regarded as available for marketing and the amount of penalty shall be computed upon the normal production of the acreage on the farm planted to cotton in excess of the farm acreage allotment. If a downward adjustment in the amount of the farm marketing excess is made pursuant to the proviso in section 345, the difference between the amount of the penalty computed upon the farm marketing excess before such adjustment and as computed upon the adjusted farm marketing excess shall be returned to or allowed the producer.

"(c) The person liable for payment or collection of the penalty shall be liable also for interest thereon at the rate of 6 per centum per annum from the date the penalty becomes due until the date of payment of such penalty.

"(d) Until the penalty on the farm marketing excess is paid, all cotton produced on the farm and marketed by the producer shall be subject to the penalty provided by this section and a lien on the entire crop of cotton produced on the farm shall be in effect in favor of the United States.

#### "LONG-STAPLE COTTON"

"SEC. 347. (a) Except as otherwise provided by this section, the provisions of this Part shall not apply (1) to cotton the staple of which is one and one-half inches or more in length or (2) to extra long staple cotton designated by the Secretary which is produced from pure strain varieties of American Egyptian, Sea Island or other similar types of extra long staple cotton having characteristics needed for various end uses for which American upland cotton is not suitable and when such varieties are produced in designated irrigated cotton-growing regions of the United States or other areas designated by the Secretary as suitable for the production of such varieties. The exemptions authorized by this subsection shall not apply to any such cotton unless ginned on a roller-type gin.

"(b) Whenever during any calendar year not later than October 15, the Secretary determines that the total supply of cotton of any one or more of the varieties covered by this section for the marketing year beginning in such calendar year will exceed the normal supply for such marketing year by more than 8 per centum, the Secretary shall proclaim such fact and a national marketing quota shall be in effect with respect to such variety or varieties of cotton during the marketing year beginning in the next calendar year.

"The Secretary shall also determine and specify in such marketing quota proclamation the amount of the national marketing quota in terms of the quantity of such extra long staple cotton adequate, together with

(1) the estimated carryover at the beginning of the marketing year which begins in the next calendar year and (2) the estimated imports during such marketing year, to make available a normal supply of such cotton. All provisions of this Act relating to marketing quotas and acreage allotments for cotton shall, insofar as applicable, apply to marketing quotas and acreage allotments for such extra long staple cotton.

#### "INELIGIBILITY FOR PAYMENTS"

"SEC. 348. (a) Any person who knowingly plants cotton on his farm in any year in excess of the farm acreage allotment for cotton for the farm for such year under section 344 shall not be eligible for any payment for such year under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended.

"(b) All persons applying for any payment of money under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, with respect to any farm located in a county in which cotton has been planted during the year for which such payment is offered, shall file with the application a statement that the applicant has not knowingly planted, during the current year, cotton on land on his farm in excess of the acreage allotted to the farm under section 344 for such year."

"SEC. 2. (a) Section 301 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended as follows:

"(1) Subsection (b) (3) (B) is amended to read: "Carry-over" of cotton for any marketing year shall be the quantity of cotton on hand in the United States at the beginning of such marketing year, not including any part of the crop which was produced in the United States during the calendar year then current."

"(2) Subsection (b) (10) is amended (i) by deleting from subparagraph (A) the word 'cotton' where it first appears and the language '40 per centum in the case of cotton' and (ii) by adding a new subparagraph (C) as follows:

"(C) The "normal supply" of cotton for any marketing year shall be the estimated domestic consumption of cotton for the marketing year for which such normal supply is being determined, plus the estimated exports of cotton for such marketing year, plus 30 per centum of the sum of such consumption and exports as an allowance for carry-over."

"(3) Subsection (b) (16) is amended by (i) striking from subparagraph (A) the word 'cotton' and (ii) by adding a new subparagraph (C) as follows:

"(C) "Total supply" of cotton for any marketing year shall be the carry-over at the beginning of such marketing year, plus the estimated production of cotton in the United States during the calendar year in which such marketing year begins and the estimated imports of cotton into the United States during such marketing year."

"(b) Section 374 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting '(a)' before the first paragraph and by adding the following new paragraph:

"(b) With respect to cotton, the Secretary, upon such terms and conditions as he may by regulation prescribe, shall provide, through the county and local committees for the measurement prior to planting of an acreage on the farm equal to the farm acreage allotment if so requested by the farm operator, and any farm on which the acreage planted to cotton does not exceed such measured acreage shall be deemed to be in compliance with the farm acreage allotment. The Secretary shall similarly provide for the remeasurement upon request by the farm operator of the acreage planted to cotton on the farm, but the operator shall be required to reimburse the local committee for the expense of such remeasurement

if the planted acreage is found to be in excess of the allotted acreage. If the acreage determined to be planted to cotton on the farm is in excess of the farm acreage allotment, the Secretary shall by appropriate regulation provide for a reasonable time within which such planted acreage may be adjusted to the farm acreage allotment."

"(c) Section 362 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Notice of the farm acreage allotment established for each farm shown by the records of the county committee to be entitled to such allotment shall insofar as practicable be mailed to the farm operator in sufficient time to be received prior to the date of the referendum."

"SEC. 3. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, Middling seven-eighths inch cotton shall be the standard grade for purposes of parity and price support.

"(b) Paragraph (9) of Public Law 74, Seventy-seventh Congress, is amended by striking out 'cotton and'.

"SEC. 4. Subsection (c) of section 358 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The national acreage allotment shall be apportioned among the States on the basis of the average acreage of peanuts harvested for nuts in the State in the five years preceding the year in which the national allotment is determined, with adjustments for trends, abnormal conditions of production, and the State peanut acreage allotment for the crop immediately preceding the crop for which the allotment hereunder is established: *Provided*, That the allotment established for any State shall be not less than (1) the allotment established for such State for the crop produced in the calendar year 1941, or (2) 60 per centum of the acreage of peanuts harvested for nuts in the calendar year 1948, whichever is larger: *Provided further*, That if the national acreage allotment in any year is less than 2,100,000 acres, then the allotment for each State after being calculated as hereinabove provided shall be reduced by the same percentage as the State allotment (as so calculated) bears to the national allotment: *And provided further*, That the national acreage allotment for the crop year 1950 shall be not less than 2,100,000 acres."

"SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the farm acreage allotment of wheat for the 1950 crop for any farm shall not be less than the larger of—

"(A) 50 per centum of—

"(1) the acreage on the farm seeded for the production of wheat in 1949, and

"(2) any other acreage seeded for the production of wheat in 1948 which was fallowed and from which no crop was harvested in the calendar year 1949, or

"(B) 50 per centum of—

"(1) the acreage on the farm seeded for the production of wheat in 1948, and

"(2) any other acreage seeded for the production of wheat in 1947 which was fallowed and from which no crop was harvested in the calendar year 1948,

adjusted in the same ratio as the national average seedings for the production of wheat during the ten calendar years 1939-1948 (adjusted as provided by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 as amended) bears to the national acreage allotment for wheat for the 1950 crop: *Provided*, That no acreage shall be included under (A) or (B) which the Secretary by appropriate regulations, determines will become an undue erosion hazard under continued farming. To the extent that the allotment to any county is insufficient to provide for such minimum farm allotments, the Secretary shall allot such county such additional acreage (which shall be in addition to the county, State, and national acreage allotments otherwise

provided for under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended) as may be necessary in order to provide for such minimum farm allotments."

And the House agree to the same.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,  
STEPHEN PACE,  
W. R. POAGE,  
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,  
AUG. H. ANDRESEN,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

ELMER THOMAS,  
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,  
CLYDE R. HOEY,  
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,  
GEORGE D. AIKEN,  
EDWARD J. THYE,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1962) to amend the cotton and wheat marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment struck out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute amendment. The committee of conference has agreed to recommend that the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House with an amendment which is a substitute for both the Senate bill and the House amendment.

The conference substitute in the main is the same as the House amendment. Except for clarifying or minor changes, the differences between the conference substitute and the House amendment are explained below:

(1) The House amendment required the Secretary of Agriculture to proclaim the need for a national marketing quota not later than November 15 of the calendar year in which such determination was made. The conference substitute changes the date to October 15.

(2) The House amendment provided for the apportionment of the State allotment among the counties in the State on the basis of the acreage planted to cotton during a period of four calendar years for the years 1950, 1951, and 1952, and thereafter on the basis of the acreage planted to cotton during the preceding five years (excluding 1949). The conference substitute provides that the State acreage allotment shall be apportioned among the counties in the State on the same basis as to years and conditions as the national allotment is apportioned to the States.

(3) The House amendment authorizes the establishment of a State reserve to be used to make adjustments in county allotments for counties adversely affected by abnormal conditions affecting plantings, or for small or new farms. The conference substitute authorizes the State reserve to be used for making adjustments in county allotments "for trends in acreages" as well as for the purposes specified in the House amendment.

(4) The House amendment made provision for the establishment of allotments for any cotton farm which had been acquired by the Federal or State government for nonfarming purposes, and which is being returned to agricultural production. Provision was also made for the establishment of allotments for farms within the State which have been acquired by persons whose cotton farms have been or are being acquired by the Federal or State government for public purposes. Under the House amendment any acreage required to provide an allotment for such farms was to be in addition to the acreage

allotments otherwise provided for the county and the State, and the production from such acreage was to be in addition to the national marketing quota. The conference substitute provides that such acreage shall be in addition to the county and State allotments and the production from such acreage shall be in addition to the national marketing quota only to the extent that such production on any such farm has not contributed to the allotment for the county and the State.

(5) The House amendment provides that the producer shall be subject to a penalty on the "farm marketing excess" at a rate per pound equal to 50 percent of the parity price of cotton. The "farm marketing excess" is the normal production of the acreage planted to cotton on the farm which is in excess of the farm acreage allotment, except that the "farm marketing excess" shall not be larger than the amount by which the actual production on the farm exceeds the normal production of the farm acreage allotment. The House amendment authorizes the farmer to store, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary, excess cotton and thereby avoid or postpone the payment of the penalty. Reductions in such stored cotton are authorized if the acreage allotment for a future crop is underplanted or if the production for a future year is less than the normal production of the farm acreage allotment. The conference substitute deletes the provisions of the House amendment which permits the farmer to store excess cotton and avoid or postpone the payment of the penalty. Also under the conference substitute, until the penalty on excess cotton is paid, all cotton produced on the farm and marketed by the producer is subject to a penalty, and a lien on the entire crop of cotton produced on the farm shall be in effect in favor of the United States.

(6) The House amendment exempted from marketing quotas cotton having a staple of  $1\frac{1}{2}$  inches or more in length unless the Secretary of Agriculture determined that the total supply of such cotton would exceed the normal supply by more than 8 percent. In addition the conference substitute authorizes the exemption of extra-long-staple cotton designated by the Secretary which is produced from pure strain varieties of American-Egyptian, Sea Island, or other similar types of extra-long-staple cotton having charac-

teristics needed for various end uses for which American upland cotton is not suitable when such varieties are produced in areas designated by the Secretary and if such cotton is ginned on roller-type gins.

(7) The conference substitute reenacts and continues in effect a provision of existing law which was not contained in the House amendment, the effect of which make a person who knowingly plants cotton in excess of the farm acreage allotment ineligible for payments under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act.

(8) The House amendment added a provision to the peanut quota law which provided that no State would receive a peanut allotment of less than 60 percent of the acreage harvested for nuts in 1948. The conference substitute retains this language with two additional provisions, as follows:

(a) The 1950 national acreage allotment for peanuts shall not be less than 2,100,000 acres;

(b) If in any year after 1950 the national acreage allotment is less than 2,100,000 acres, the allotment for each State shall be reduced in the same proportion as the national acreage allotment is reduced below 2,100,000.

The intention of the conferees may best be shown by reference to the table, marked "Exhibit A," hereto attached and made a part hereof. In column 7 is shown the minimum acreage allotment to each State under this section when the national acreage allotment is 2,100,000 acres or more (subject to slight adjustments to reflect the difference between 2,100,000 and 2,098,317). That is, if the national peanut acreage for 1950 should be proclaimed as 2,100,000 acres, then each of the States listed would be allotted the respective number of acres shown in column 7. In the event the national allotment in some subsequent year should be less than 2,100,000 acres, then, in such event, the minimum allotment to each of these States is to be reduced to the same extent and in the same ratio as such national allotment is reduced under 2,100,000 acres. For example, if in 1951 or later year the national allotment should be proclaimed as 1,890,000 acres (10 percent under 2,100,000) then the minimum allotment for each State as set forth in column 7 would be reduced 10 percent.

EXHIBIT A.—Peanut-acreage allotments, 1950: Based on proposed legislation

State	1949 allotment <sup>1</sup>	Column 1 factored to 1,610,000 acres	1941 allotment	1950 allotment (larger of column 2 or column 3) <sup>2</sup>	1948 acreage picked and threshed	60 per cent of column 5	Larger of columns 4 or 6	Increase due to present 1941 minimum provisions (column 4 minus column 2)	Increase due to proposed amendment (column 7 minus column 4)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Alabama	397,320	245,271	274,907	274,907	449,000	269,400	274,907	29,636	-----
Arizona	401	247	0	247	0	0	247	-----	-----
Arkansas	8,184	5,052	5,473	5,473	8,000	4,800	5,473	421	-----
California	1,267	776	1,257	1,257	0	0	1,257	481	-----
Florida	82,640	51,015	73,236	73,236	110,000	66,000	73,236	22,221	-----
Georgia	873,092	538,971	550,694	550,694	1,169,000	701,400	701,400	11,723	130,706
Louisiana	3,887	2,399	353	2,399	3,000	1,800	2,399	-----	-----
Mississippi	14,117	8,715	2,476	8,715	15,000	9,000	9,000	-----	285
Missouri	401	247	0	247	0	0	247	-----	-----
New Mexico	8,256	5,096	3,673	5,096	9,000	5,400	5,400	-----	304
North Carolina	242,463	149,675	225,702	225,702	295,000	177,000	225,702	76,027	-----
Oklahoma	183,733	113,421	61,607	113,421	306,000	183,600	183,600	-----	70,179
South Carolina	25,165	15,535	18,375	18,375	26,000	15,600	18,375	2,840	-----
Tennessee	5,524	3,410	4,766	4,766	5,000	3,000	4,766	1,356	-----
Texas	620,531	383,062	246,373	383,062	752,000	451,200	451,200	-----	68,133
Virginia	141,108	87,108	141,108	141,108	314,000	98,400	141,108	54,000	-----
Total	2,608,079	1,610,000	1,610,000	1,808,705	3,311,000	1,986,600	2,098,317	198,705	289,612

<sup>1</sup> Excluding new farms.

<sup>2</sup> Minimum 1950 allotment under present legislation, assuming a national allotment of 1,610,000 acres.

(9) Section 3 of the conference substitute retains the provision of the House amendment relative to the establishment of Middling  $\frac{3}{8}$ -inch cotton as the standard grade for purposes of parity and price support.

This means that for price support purposes, parity will be deemed to apply to Middling  $\frac{3}{8}$ -inch cotton. Thus, the percentage of parity at which price support is required to be made available for cotton will be



deemed to apply to Middling  $\frac{3}{8}$ -inch cotton. As in the past appropriate adjustments will be made from such standard for other grades and staple lengths. The effect of this provision is that the basis upon which the schedule of support prices for cotton has heretofore been arrived at will continue in effect in the future.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,  
STEPHEN PACE,  
W. R. POAGE,  
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,  
AUG. H. ANDRESEN,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, in explanation of the action of the conferees, may I say that this is a unanimous report on the part of the conferees of the House and Senate and, further, it is substantially the bill as it passed the House.

A brief explanation of the changes in the bill. It was provided that the Secretary of Agriculture should proclaim marketing quotas not later than November 15. That date has been changed to not later than October 15 in the report.

The Senate bill provided that the allotment to the counties should be made on the same basis as the allotment received by the State, while the House bill provided that the allotment to the counties should be on the basis of the preceding 4 years for the 3 years 1950, 1951, and 1952. The language provided in the Senate bill was accepted.

The House bill provided that the State committee could reserve 10 percent of the State allotment to be used in adjusting county allotments adversely affected by the abnormal conditions affecting plantings, for small and new farms. The Senate bill contained also the provision that this reserve acreage could be used in making adjustments in county allotments for trends in acreages. That provision was added to the House language, so that the bill as reported would authorize a 10-percent reserve for making adjustments in the county allotments for trends in acreages as well as for adjustments in county allotments adversely affected by abnormal conditions affecting plantings, for small farms and for new farms.

The House bill contained a provision whereby if a cotton farm was taken over by the Federal Government or State government for public purposes the owner could acquire an acreage allotment on another farm within the State. The House provided that such acreage should be in addition to the national allotment. That is modified in the report to the extent that the acreage needed shall be in addition only to the extent that the production on any such farm has not contributed to the allotment for the county and the State.

The most substantial change in the bill was that the House bill carried a provision authorizing a noncooperator—that is, a cotton producer who exceeded his allotment—to store his excess production; that is, cotton produced on the excess acreage. That provision is stricken from the bill as reported by the conferees.

The provision as to the exemption for long-staple cotton is revised, but no substantial change is made. The provision in the present law which prohibits a non-

cooperator from receiving his ACP payments, that is, payments under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, is included in the bill as agreed upon. And also the section giving the United States a lien on the entire crop of cotton until the penalty on the farm marketing excess is paid.

There is a provision giving a minimum allotment to States with regard to peanut acreage allotments. That is retained in the bill with a proviso adding that the national allotment for 1950 should not be less than 2,100,000 acres, and that if the acreage in future years is reduced to less than that figure, then the allotment for each State shall be reduced in the same proportion as the national allotment is reduced.

That, Mr. Speaker, covers the principal changes in the bill as passed by the House and, as I stated, it is substantially the bill as it passed the House.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I realize that the Committee on Agriculture has had a very difficult task, and I am in agreement with the general provisions of the conference report. I claim the privilege of adding my personal commendation for the chairman. I realize he has had a complicated problem to deal with. I think the chairman forgave me for the interruptions which I caused in the consideration of this bill when it was before the House.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman need not apologize for that. His interruptions were quite helpful to the committee.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I appreciate that. The thing that some of us have been vitally concerned about is that, in this transition that is taking place in the cotton economy, we avoid those two dangers that are ever present: First, the imposition upon the little farmers who are inevitably to be squeezed out; and the other is that in helping him get into other types of farming we do not bankrupt the United States Treasury. I know the gentleman has been sensitive to both of those considerations, and sometimes they are very hard to harmonize.

Mr. PACE. May I say to the gentleman that the provision seeking to protect the small farmer is retained in the bill exactly as it passed the House. There was no modification in that language.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I am very gratified over that. I understand, then, that the provision that allows this item of 10 and 15 percent for special situations is retained?

Mr. PACE. That is retained in the bill exactly as it passed the House without any change whatsoever, except the one change I mentioned, where we did add, besides small farms, new farms, "and for trends in acreage." That was the only change. That is where there has been a shift in production in a State.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The fears that I expressed in the debate regarding the larger acreage are somewhat allayed by some of the statements the gentleman has made; that is, that there will

be no prospect of that larger acreage for 1950.

Mr. PACE. The minimum acreage of 21,000,000 in 1950 applies only to the one year.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The cotton farmers are greatly indebted to the gentleman from Georgia. He has striven to ascertain the facts upon which a permanent policy might be developed. That policy must release those producers whose lands are adapted to cotton to achieve high production and must gradually place emphasis upon high yields and lower production costs. The marginal or high-cost producer cannot indefinitely maintain a high support price, for the high price in peacetimes always depends upon restricted acreage or weather adversities.

A 5,000,000-bale carry-over from the 1948 crop is proof that we cannot afford unlimited acreage. A lower price, gradually achieved, is our only hope, unless new demands now unforeseen should develop. The efficient low-cost producer has nothing to fear from this if we work out a good national policy. I realize that there is a stark economic law operating against the small producer. It must be respected. In this period of quotas he cannot always be guaranteed as much as adequate living standards require, unrelated to market and other factors, for we would either place an unjust burden on the Treasury or penalize the owners, tenants, and laborers who depend upon the large operations. A share cropper is a little man, too, though part of a large operation.

I hope we can find a better formula to balance the various interests.

One thing I fear is that Congress may not face the realities of these terrific postwar changes in the cotton situation. We cannot guarantee a high price without inconveniences to a lot of people. It is not pleasant to tell producers about these inconveniences but in justice to the over-all requirements we have to ask for a give-and-take attitude.

The Government must help the cotton farmers through the present difficulty and the cotton price-support program is only one phase of it.

We must keep the prices up for other commodities, for livestock, peanuts, fruits, and related crops so that diversification is attractive. We must keep the Farmers Home Administration well equipped to provide credit needed by the farmers who cannot get out of cotton without help.

There is another phase to the transition that has not been developed and that is the perfecting of an industrial policy that will provide greater opportunities at home. My belief in the efficacy of this program led me to urge that the minimum-hourly rate be held to 65 cents for the present. The majority of the House took an opposite view and this decision reduces our hopes for industrial expansion to replace our shrinking cotton system. This is not defeatism, I am merely enumerating the various factors in a total program for the cotton section's relief. What we do for the survival of these distressed groups

must not be at the expense of other sections or other commodity groups. It is a national problem and one that will require many years to solve. At this stage it is well to resolve that we will relate this issue to other legislation in a manner that moves us gradually toward a sound policy.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to express my appreciation of the wonderful work done by my colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma, Representative ALBERT, on this measure.

The Albert amendment, providing for guaranteed acreage on peanuts, will ensure to Oklahoma farmers that their scant acreage quotas will not be further reduced to a devastating figure.

Because Oklahoma farmers had not had a long history of peanut raising, the quota base first proposed in the bill, and in the former law, would have resulted in our State losing more than 70,000 acres of our quota. This would have been in addition to the reduction of 40 percent which we were compelled to take under our 1948 acreage.

The Albert amendment will insure that Oklahoma farmers may plant a total of 183,600 acres and will more nearly place us on a parity with other States.

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] not only drafted the corrective amendment which gave us a fairer share of the national quota, but because of his leadership on the important Agricultural Committee was able to secure its adoption by the committee and its passage by the House of Representatives.

When difficulty developed in the conference committee, it was the work of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] in explaining the justice of his proposal that resulted in final approval of the amendment.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. I do not know whether or not I understood the gentleman correctly. But, in view of the fact that there is such a great surplus of cotton, I think it should be understood, as we were made to believe, that the acreage will be reduced. I understand the gentleman said that there should not be less than 2,500,000 acres for any one State; is that right?

Mr. PACE. No.

Mr. SABATH. Not less; instead of not more.

Mr. PACE. Let me clarify that. Let me say, first, that the acreage in cotton this year is in excess of 26,000,000 acres. The bill provides that next year the allotment shall not be less than 21,000,000. Then the bill further provides that thereafter the allotments shall not be less than 10,000,000 bales, or 1,000,000

bales less than the previous year's consumption and exports. Then, if in 1951 we should drop down to 10,000,000 bales on the basis of the average yield the last 5 years, the national allotment will be 17,880,000 acres, which means that within 2 years we will have gone down from in excess of 26,000,000 acres to a little below 18,000,000 acres, which I am sure the gentleman will agree, when you have to adjust your economy to such a reduction, is just about as fast as it can go down.

Mr. SABATH. I am interested, of course, in the cotton growers. In view of the tremendous acreage and tremendous yield the last few years and the surplus we have, and the great amount of money it costs the Government for storage, and so on, I was hopeful and I was led to believe that the acreage would be reduced, but as the gentleman himself states, instead of providing that it should be no more than 21,000,000 acres, he said it should not be less than 21,000,000 acres.

Mr. PACE. I think I can assure the gentleman it will be 21,000,000 acres, because I am sure the Secretary will be disposed to go as low as he can.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I doubt if there is a man in the House who represents more small cotton farmers than I do.

What I am afraid of is that this is going to drive many of them from their fields.

When they put on the acreage limitation 15 years ago it was "duck soup" for the big planters, but it drove many little farmers into bankruptcy.

Today they are talking about a surplus of cotton. By driving the little farmer from his field, by limiting his acreage, they forced the price of cotton up and encouraged the production of cotton in Brazil and other foreign countries.

We have what looks like a disaster in the Southern States today. We have the worst boll-weevil infestation we have had for at least 16 years.

Another thing I dislike about this limitation is that you deny to the ex-serviceman the right to start cotton farming.

The other day when we tried to guarantee him at least 5 acres by the Beckworth amendment it was voted down.

We are going to have a great deal of unemployment in that section of the South that depends on the small cotton farmer. I am just wondering if you are not getting ready to again expand the production of the big planter and restrict the possibilities for the little farmer to make a living. That is what I am concerned about.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER. I do not want to heckle; I really am asking for information. Are the small cotton farmers down there mostly sharecroppers? I am not trying to set a trap, or anything of the sort. I am asking for information.

Mr. RANKIN. A large percentage own their land.

Let me say to the gentleman from Missouri that down there invariably you cannot tell a renter from the man who owns the land. Many farmers do not want to own land, because they would have to pay the taxes whether they make any crop or not, to say nothing of the expense of keeping the property in good condition.

That burden falls on the landowner. But I will say a majority of these people own their small farms.

I have heard a great deal of talk about labor here lately. I have done all kinds of work that a man is supposed to do in the South, and I say frankly that I have never seen any man work harder than a cotton farmer works, not in the shade but in the hot sun.

He makes 1 cent an hour on an average for every cent a pound that he gets for his lint cotton. That means last year he got 32 cents an hour.

As I said, he is just about the hardest worker in America.

He gets less per hour for his work and takes all the chances of having his crop ruined by rains or destroyed by the boll weevil. And yet here you come along and put a floor under the other fellow of 75 cents an hour and then limit this little fellow so that he cannot really exercise his prerogative of making a living on his own land.

Let me remind you that the small white cotton farmers of the South sent the largest percentage of their sons to the recent war of any other people in America.

The Government levied a quota on each State according to the population, and then proceeded to take a preponderance of white boys to do the fighting. They did not regard cotton as a necessity, and, therefore, allowed no exemptions for cotton farmers. The result was that they took a larger percentage of the white cotton farmers of the South into the service than any other class of people in America.

Now to limit those small farmers to where they cannot grow enough cotton to pay their bills, and deny the ex-serviceman who has not been growing cotton the privilege of entering into that activity, is something I simply cannot understand.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require, in order to answer the gentleman from Mississippi.

In response to the statement made by the gentleman from Mississippi, I think it needs to be said that there has never been presented to the Congress any piece of legislation having to do with the limitation of production which is so liberal, with such beneficial provisions for the small farmer, as that set forth in the conference report.

Let me correct one further statement which has so often been made—that the limitations on the production of cotton have driven the production of cotton to foreign countries. About 30 years ago we were planting about 44,000,000 acres of cotton in this country. We were producing on the average of about 11,000,000



bales. We have now cut the acreage in cotton practically in half and I think it needs to be said we are now producing more cotton on half of the acreage than we formerly produced on all the 44,000,000 acres. For example, last year when only 23,000,000 acres of cotton were planted we produced 15,000,000 bales of cotton, and every year since marketing quotas have been in effect the production in cotton has been greater than before we had marketing quotas. Marketing quotas—let me say this, perhaps everybody will not agree with me—but marketing quotas on cotton has contributed more to efficiency in farming than anything that has ever happened to the farmers of this Nation. Mark my word, within a few years we are going to be producing on only 17,000,000 acres more cotton than we ever produced on the 44,000,000 acres or the 26,000,000 acres that we have in production this year. I do not know of anything that contributes more to efficient farming; I do not know anything that contributes more to the conservation of the soils of this Nation than marketing quota provisions as they relate to cotton.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I am sorry; I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. Will this bill do away with the assured acreage of peanuts under the existing law to the States of Virginia and North Carolina?

Mr. PACE. There are two protective provisions. There is one providing that the peanut-acreage allotment for any State shall not be less than its allotment in 1941. Of course that, as the gentleman knows, protects the State of North Carolina and the State of Virginia. Then, to recognize the trends in production, as the bill does in the case of cotton and in the case of wheat, there is a provision that the minimum allotment to any other State shall not be less than 60 percent of its 1948 harvested acreage. The bill then provides that the 1950 acreage allotment shall not be less than 2,100,000 acres. That will assure the State of Virginia and the State of North Carolina their full 1941 allotment. After that, if the Secretary has to go below the 2,100,000 acres, then the agreement provides that each State, including the States of North Carolina, Virginia, and all the other States, shall have their minimum allotment reduced in the same proportion as the national allotment is reduced under the 2,100,000 acres.

Mr. BONNER. I understand that.

Now, may I ask the chairman this question: The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture in the House was a member of the conference committee. The senior Senator from North Carolina was a member of the conference committee. Did the two conferees I have mentioned agree to the arrangement in this conference report?

Mr. PACE. What two are those?

Mr. BONNER. The senior Senator from North Carolina and the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture in the House.

Mr. PACE. They both joined in the conference report.

Mr. BONNER. And this was satisfactory to them?

Mr. PACE. So far as I am advised, it was.

I now yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman talks about their making more cotton on a smaller acreage. I call attention to the fact that, instead of requiring the farmers to diversify, when they put on this program years ago, they just cut each one proportionately and drove many little cotton farmers out of the field.

The big planters have been able to buy fertilizer, such as nitrate of soda, intensively cultivate, and make more cotton than before.

If you will go back and search, you will find that the little fellow was getting it in the neck, and I fear he is going to get it in the neck under this bill.

Mr. PACE. Not under this bill.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. BONNER. With respect to peanuts; Yesterday I understood the gentleman from Georgia to advise me that the State committee could take into consideration historical plantings—old growers as against new growers, in making the necessary reduction in the allocation in the States.

Mr. PACE. The present law provides that among other elements to be considered in making farm allotments is the allotment made to the farm under the previous programs where marketing quotas were in effect. That is not only permissive but it is a mandatory provision.

Mr. BONNER. Therefore, the State committees could give preference to old growers, prior to the establishment of new peanut quotas? Should the acreage be reduced below 2,100,000.

Mr. PACE. To the extent of taking into consideration previous allotments they have received on the farm.

I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I am amazed to hear the statement of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] that under the law we have passed the small cotton farmer has been discriminated against. I have at all times urged, advocated and supported aid for the small farmer. It was never my intention to especially help the big cotton planters.

Now, if the statement of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is true, that the big planters have taken advantage under the law to drive the little fellow, in whom I have always been interested as to every piece of legislation that has been proposed, out, I want to know how it was permitted, and whether under this bill the big planter will be in a position to drive the little fellow out.

Mr. RANKIN. It is often said that the difference between a planter and a farmer is that the planter farms the farmer, and the farmer farms the farm.

The little fellow is the man who does the work. Where he owns his own home

or he has to rent a small piece of ground, under that restriction years ago he was driven to where he could not raise enough cotton to pay his taxes and meet other necessary expenses, while the big planters made more money than he had ever made before.

Mr. SABATH. Of course, I am informed that conditions even in the gentleman's State of Mississippi, and all through the South, are much better than they were before. I am indeed gratified that conditions have improved, and I hope they will continue to improve, but I am not promoting the interest of the big planter as against the little fellow who is being discriminated against under any legislation; and I hope that this bill will really provide a safeguard for the little fellow.

Mr. PACE. I can give the gentleman assurance that it will.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, this is a unanimous report on the part of the committee on conference. As has already been stated by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, the conference report embodies substantially everything we had in the House bill. Such changes as were made in the House bill are very minor. As a matter of fact, the entire legislation changes the present law only in matters of detail and administration; it does not put us in the field of any new policies or principles as far as this type of legislation is concerned.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I still am not clear with reference to the person who plants cotton on his farm for the first time, the returned veteran who wants to grow a little cotton but who has no past history of having grown cotton. I would appreciate it if the gentleman would explain this point and how it would work out with reference to this type of farmer.

Mr. PACE. The bill provides for a State allotment, which in the case of Mississippi I believe is about 2,500,000 acres. It then provides that the State committee can reserve 10 percent of that, or 250,000 acres. The State committee can use this to take care of trends in production among counties within the State. I understand there have been trends between the northern and southern parts of Mississippi. The State committee can also take care of the case where there has been an abnormally adverse condition brought about through planting. It may also use some of this reserve to take care of these small farmers the gentleman from Illinois was talking about, and give them increased acreage. The State committee also can use this reserve to make allocations to veterans about whom the gentleman from Mississippi has spoken; that is a man who under the strict application of the formula would get nothing, can receive an allocation from the State committee to the county committee for that purpose. Not only does this 10-percent reservation apply to the State committee but likewise to the county committee which can reserve an additional 10 percent for the same purpose.

I may say that never has there been a bill in my experience in the Congress

that gives as sympathetic consideration to the welfare of the little producer or the man who is not under the regular formula, because it allows the State and the county committees to make provision for them.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the gentleman consider that provision to be sufficient to take care of the situation down there without further specification?

Mr. PACE. I will put it this way: It is most generous, taking into account the welfare of the old cotton growers. The gentleman understands that in these matters you cannot give anybody any cotton acreage unless you take it away from somebody else. Taking into account the welfare of all of the cotton growers of Mississippi I think this is just as far as the committee can afford to go.

Mr. RANKIN. Then why not take it from the big farmer who puts everything into cotton and give it to the little fellow who raises corn, and peas, hogs, and cows, give him more cotton acreage in order that he may pay his taxes?

Mr. PACE. I think we have gone just as far in that direction as the committee or the Congress will want to go—much further than with any other commodity.

Mr. RANKIN. No; you are applying the strait-jacket to the peanut and tobacco growers; it will not work with the cotton farmers.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. LARCADE. As the gentleman from Georgia probably knows, this year there has been a general infestation of boll weevils in my section of Louisiana.

Mr. PACE. It has not been peculiar to the gentleman's State.

Mr. LARCADE. The question arises under the circumstances whether or not it would be possible to get an increased allocation for that portion of the State that was hurt by this infestation.

Mr. PACE. No; the bill does not deal with the question of production; it deals with the question of acreage.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. I have been asked whether Members representing the peanut-producing districts of Virginia and North Carolina agreed to the provisions of this bill, and it is my understanding that they did.

Mr. PACE. It was represented to the conferees that while they were in no way enthusiastic about it, that in the light of all the circumstances they did not make any objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield.

Mr. BECKWORTH. It was pointed out in the debate the other day that eight-tenths of 1 percent of the peanut acreage went to new peanut farmers.

Mr. PACE. Yes.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Eight-tenths of 1 percent.

Mr. PACE. That is not dealt with in this bill.

Mr. BECKWORTH. The gentleman does not think that will occur with reference to cotton?

Mr. PACE. No.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Then the gentleman pointed out that Oklahoma lost 54 percent of her peanut acreage under the peanut quota. I believe it was said that she had a loss of 50 percent of her wheat acreage. The gentleman does not think anything like that might happen in regard to cotton, does he?

Mr. PACE. No, it will not. We have tried to give sympathetic consideration to the situation in Oklahoma, so ably represented on the committee by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. The national allotment on wheat is already out. Oklahoma has taken about a 20-percent cut in wheat which is in line with cuts taken by the other States. We will get an additional 150,000 acres under this bill. We did take a 40-percent cut in peanuts and one county did take a 57-percent cut last year. Our State did not take a 57-percent cut in peanuts last year. Under this bill, we will take no cut next year.

Mr. BECKWORTH. I was simply using the figures as used by the chairman of the subcommittee here the other day. If he was mistaken, it is his mistake, not mine.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there is no reason why we as a Congress cannot protect the weak from the strong without being called Communists. I realize the fears of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], and I do wish to call attention to two facts.

I have served here with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] for 10 years. If there is any Member of Congress who is interested in the average or small-type farmer, it is the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]. But he is just one Member.

The second point is, if this program is not carried out to an exact nicety in every county in the United States, I do not think we should take the position that we are going to blame the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] for it, either, because that is not going to be his responsibility. That is going to be the responsibility of the executive branch of our Government.

I also realize that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] the other day brought up something that surely is of interest to every person who has followed the agricultural trends in this country. We have one wheat grower who has grown practically 600,000 bushels of wheat this year. We only need about a thousand of such producers in the United States. We have comparable growers producing other agricultural products in abundance. That is why and where we get the surpluses. We need only a few hundred of those in the United States. But we must remember when we go into that kind of farming, be it in this country or in any other country, and have the land all owned by a few people, they always end up in trouble. Our thinking should support the idea that was brought out the other day by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH].

There are other problems involved in two big farm operations. There is the social problem involved. We have to

have some kind of base to protect the small operator, and I say that without any danger of being accused of demagoguery because my State of Wisconsin is based upon the family-sized farm. Our farms are largely family farms that are largely owned and operated by the family. There is very little farm tenancy in the State. I feel that the welfare of the Nation depends upon these family farms. We do have many, many social problems that result from the land being owned and operated by the few.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The other day the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] offered an amendment to guarantee every little farmer the right to plant 5 acres of cotton. That amendment was voted down, and they were denied that privilege. They are the ones the county committees have found to be the legitimate cotton farmers. That is not the new man who is coming in. With the boll-weevil situation raging as it is, he could not pay the taxes on his land with less than 5 acres of cotton. So you are squeezing him out of the picture.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I do not have to defend the gentleman from Georgia. But, let me call your attention to the fact that the committee worked for 6 months or more on this particular legislation. I am sure that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], during all of that time, in his mind and in his heart, was trying to protect the same people that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] called to our attention. Rome was not built in a day, and it takes time to unscramble these legislative eggs.

I feel that a majority of the Members believe in a farm program based on the family unit. I think the next turn in legislation will be in that direction. We do not want a few big landowners, and many agricultural peasants. For the future of our country we want to build up the family units. I hope that will eventually be accomplished.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS].

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] revealed some startling facts during the debate on this floor a few days ago when we were considering the merits of the bill having to do with cotton acreage allotments, and which is now before us again on consideration of the conference report. He said that only 50 percent of income received from cotton goes to seven-eighths of producers, while the other 50 percent goes to one-eighth of the planters. This means, Mr. Speaker, that seven-eighths of all the small cotton farmers put together derive merely 50 percent of the income, while the large planters with mechanized facilities, numbering only one-eighth of the people producing cotton get 50 percent of the income from cotton.

More disturbing still is the fact that what is happening to the small tiller of the soil in the cotton industry is also happening to all our other farming industry. When we were considering the general legislation with regard to the



parity and support-price program a few weeks ago, I was amazed and astounded to read from the report of the Committee on Agriculture that 2 percent of the farmers in the United States produce 25 percent of all our farm products. Here again this handful of 2 percent of producers comprise large operators, many of whom and perhaps most of whom are corporate and absentee landowners.

But that is not all, Mr. Speaker. Stated in a different way and translated in terms of money, the foregoing means that of all money we appropriate to support the cotton program, 50 percent is paid to only one-eighth of the large cotton planters, while seven-eighths of all the little men behind the plow receive only 50 percent, and taking agriculture as a whole, it means that of all the money we make available for agriculture 25 percent thereof is paid to 2 percent of the large landowners, and 98 percent of the small farmers, the tillers of the soil, derive only 75 percent of the benefits.

The only consoling feature about this situation is the fact that the great House Committee on Agriculture is composed of such staunch friends of agriculture as its chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], and such distinguished members as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY], and others equally qualified.

Still, Mr. Speaker, I have some misgivings about the proposed cotton acreage and allotment program. I earnestly hope that it will work to the interest of the small cotton farmers and that the facts which I have given will provoke the careful thought of the committee and result in further study if necessary.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'EWARD].

Mr. D'EWARD. Mr. Speaker, the provisions of the conference report on acreage allotments will correct a grave injustice that has been done to Montana wheat farmers under the old law.

Montana, one of the principal wheat producing States of the Nation, will receive a much more favorable acreage allotment under the terms of this proposal.

The wheat farmers of my State were greatly alarmed at the 23 percent cut in wheat acreage which was decreed by the Secretary of Agriculture a few weeks ago. They compared this reduction with the national average reduction of only 17 percent and the smaller reductions of other wheat States and they felt they were being asked to make too great a sacrifice.

At that time I stated I would work for and support legislation to correct the allotment system so that our State and others in a similar position would receive proper consideration. I am glad to note that this conference report will do just that. In adopting the report, the Congress will prevent a serious and needless injury to the agricultural economy of my State.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL].

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, this is a unanimous committee report. As a mem-

ber of the Committee on Agriculture, I am sure that I never witnessed a more constant and thorough attention to legislation than was given to this bill by our good subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]. I am sure the committee and the House appreciate how hard he has worked on the many problems that arise over details of such legislation. Congressman PACE has demonstrated his broad and thorough understanding of the issues involved in crop acreage controls from the standpoint of the small farm producers as well as the problems of larger farm operators.

Mr. Speaker, several counties in the State of Colorado were critically affected by the Secretary of Agriculture's proclamation of 1950 wheat-acreage allotments. Colorado was reduced nearly 1,000,000 acres—over 35 percent. Several counties in the Second Congressional District of Colorado that had increased their wheat acreage since 1946 were critically curtailed and some wheat farmers placed in a position where their operations could not possibly continue to be successful.

In section 5 of S. 1962, cotton-acreage allotments and marketing quotas, provision was made for the protection of farm-acreage allotments of wheat for the 1950 crop.

Before discussing the section of this bill that protects the wheat growers of Colorado, let me review briefly how the Department of Agriculture arrives at the wheat-acreage allotments.

The national acreage allotment for wheat is the acreage which the Secretary of Agriculture determines on the basis of the national average yield will produce an amount of wheat together with the estimated carry-over at the beginning of the marketing year to make available a supply of wheat equal to a normal year's domestic consumption and exports plus 30 percent.

The national acreage allotment is then apportioned among the several States on the basis of the acreage seeded for the production of wheat during the 10 calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the allotment is determined—plus, in applicable years, the acreage diverted under previous agricultural adjustment and conservation programs—with adjustments for abnormal weather conditions and for trends in acreage during such period.

The State acreage allotment is then apportioned among the counties in the State, on the basis of the acreage seeded for the production of wheat during the 10 calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the national acreage allotment is determined—plus in applicable years, the acreage diverted under previous agricultural adjustment program—with adjustments for abnormal weather conditions and trends in acreage during such period and for the promotion of soil conservation practices.

The allotment to the county is then apportioned through the local committees among the farms within the county

on the basis of tillable acres, crop-rotation practices, type of soil, and topography. Not more than 3 percent of the county allotment is required to be apportioned to farms on which wheat has not been planted during any of the three marketing years immediately preceding the marketing year in which the allotment is made.

You will observe that under the preceding paragraph the law does not actually require that farm-acreage allotments be based upon prior history, except that a farm to be eligible for an old farm allotment must have had wheat planted during one of the immediately preceding years. However, in administering the act the Department has given principal weight to the prior wheat history of the farm in making the farm allotments.

Notwithstanding any of the foregoing provisions, this bill, H. R. 5738, provides for the establishment of minimum farm acreage allotments for the 1950 crop. Under the provisions of section 5 of the bill the farm acreage allotment of wheat for the 1950 crop may not be less than the larger of, first, one-half of the acreage on the farm seeded for the production of wheat in 1949 and any other acreage on the farm which was seeded for the production of wheat in 1948, but which was summer fallowed and on which no crop was harvested in the calendar year 1949; or, second, one-half of the acreage on the farm seeded for the production of wheat in 1948 and any other acreage on the farm which was seeded for the production of wheat in 1947, but which was summer fallowed and on which no crop was harvested in the calendar year 1948, adjusted in the same ratio as the national average seedings for the production of wheat during the 10 calendar years 1939-48 as adjusted bears to the national acreage allotment for 1950. The additional acreage required by virtue of this section is to be in addition to the county, State, and national acreage allotment.

This provision was designed to afford relief to those farms and those areas which have substantially expanded their wheat acreage in the last one or two years and which, if it were not for the relief provided by this provision, would suffer a reduction in 1950 greatly out of proportion to the reduction taken by other farms generally. This provision also gives recognition to good farming practices by giving credit to summer fallowed land. This provision is also of great importance in areas where summer fallowing is customarily practiced and will put those farms on which good farming practices have been followed on an equal footing with farms which have been fully cropped.

This is very necessary legislation and I am sure will bring immediate relief to many sections in the West.

*Estimated maximum increased acreage resulting from application of this wheat amendment*

Colorado	500,000
Montana	350,000
Texas	150,000
Oklahoma	150,000
Kansas	100,000
Idaho	100,000
Wyoming	50,000

As part of my remarks I enclose a letter from the Eastern Colorado Development Association:

EASTERN COLORADO  
DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION,  
Eads, Colo., August 2, 1949.

Hon. Representative WILLIAM S. HILL,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HILL: The Eastern Colorado Development Association wishes to thank you for the interest you have shown and the efforts you have put forth to forestall economic disaster in the High Plains area. Your recent bill containing provisions for wheat acreage allotments is clear evidence of your complete understanding of our situation.

We of ECDA have discussed your bill thoroughly with representative groups in this area, and the following comments will show its unanimous acceptance by eastern Colorado wheat farmers.

1. The bill will forestall economic disaster among wheat farmers in this area. The present law does not provide for expanded areas and is thus a detriment to soil conservation programs and good farming practice.

2. The provisions of the bill promote good farming practices. The practice of summer fallowing semi-arid lands is well established and proven. The enforcement of this practice will be regarded as a milestone in furthering the development of this rich farming area.

3. The plan is workable. All farmers in this area realize the benefits of strong Government support and are willing to cooperate with acreage allotments as long as good practices are not penalized, and such action by Government is required to stabilize the industry.

4. The plan is reasonable. Inasmuch as the national cut is the maximum cut expected of any farmer, regardless of historical background, our farmers accept the plan as reasonable and pledge to support same.

5. The error in total acreage of a State is eliminated. The present acreage figures used by State PMA in securing a base for what acreage are admittedly in error. The bill is a guaranty to every farmer that his full acreage will be used to determine his seeded acres.

Again we thank you and give our assurance of support when this bill becomes law.

Very truly yours,

H. O. WALES, President.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JENNINGS asked and was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a pamphlet written by a great Baptist minister who began his career in the State of Texas and is now known throughout the world, Rev. Frederick Brown.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and ex-

tend his remarks and also to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and in one to include a table.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article on China. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the RECORD and will cost \$273.34, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made on the conference report. I want to show that these little cotton farmers furnished a larger proportion of their sons to this war than any other class in America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

#### SELECT COMMITTEE ON LOBBYING ACTIVITIES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 298 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That there is hereby created a Select Committee on Lobbying Activities to be composed of seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a study and investigation of (1) all lobbying activities intended to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation; and (2) all activities of agencies of the Federal Government intended to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation.

The committee may from time to time submit to the House such preliminary reports as it deems advisable; and prior to the close of the present Congress shall submit to the House its final report on the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable. Any report submitted when the House is not in session may be filed with the Clerk of the House.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 176]

Abbott	Gwinn	Pfeiffer,
Andresen,	Hall,	William L.
August H.	Leonard W.	Phillips
Bailey	Harrison	Phillips, Tenn.
Baring	Hart	Plumley
Barrett, Pa.	Hébert	Poage
Bentsen	Heffernan	Poulson
Bishop	Heller	Powell
Bland	Herlong	Quinn
Blatnik	Herter	Ramsay
Boggs, La.	Hinshaw	Redden
Bolling	Hoffman, Ill.	Reed, Ill.
Bolton, Ohio	Hope	Rees
Bosone	Horan	Regan
Breen	Howell	Ribicoff
Brooks	Huber	Riehlman
Buckley, N. Y.	James	Rogers, Mass.
Bulwinkle	Jonas	Roosevelt
Burleson	Kearney	Sadowski
Burton	Kee	St. George
Canfield	Keefe	Sasscer
Celler	Kennedy	Scott, Hardie
Chatham	Keogh	Scott,
Chelf	Kilburn	Hugh D., Jr.
Chesney	Kilday	Secrest
Chipperfield	King	Shafer
Chudoff	Kirwan	Short
Clemente	Klein	Sikes
Clevenger	Lane	Smith, Ohio
Cole, N. Y.	Latham	Smith, Va.
Cooley	Lichtenwalter	Staggers
Corbett	Lind	Stanley
Coudert	Lovre	Taylor
Dague	Lucas	Teague
Davies, N. Y.	Lyle	Thomas, N. J.
Davis, Tenn.	McCarthy	Thornberry
Delaney	McGregor	Tollefson
Denton	Macy	Towe
Dingell	Mahon	Underwood
Dollinger	Marshall	Velde
Dolliver	Martin, Mass.	Vinson
Donohue	Mason	Wadsworth
Eaton	Miles	Weichel
Ellsworth	Miller, Calif.	Welch, Calif.
Fellows	Murdock	Whitaker
Fulton	Murphy	White, Idaho
Gilmer	Norton	Wickersham
Gordon	O'Neill	Wilson, Ind.
Gore	Patman	Wilson, Tex.
Gorski, N. Y.	Patterson	Winstead
Gossett	Peterson	Withrow
Granahan	Pfeifer,	Wood
Green	Joseph L.	
Gregory		

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BECKWORTH). On this roll call 273 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### SELECT COMMITTEE ON LOBBYING ACTIVITIES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for the appointment of 7 members of a committee which will be authorized and directed to conduct a study and investigation of, first, all lobbying activities intended to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation; and, second, all activities of the Federal Government intended to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation.

I feel that the resolution should have been broader so as to include, first, the activities of persons or organizations not directly employed or engaged on salary but retained by firms or corporations on a contingent fee basis to obtain contracts from Government agencies or Government-owned corporations; and, second, the activities of former Government employees and retired officers of the armed services receiving retirement pay, now employed on a salary or fee basis by firms



or corporations doing business with Government agencies or Government-owned corporations.

On May 18 the House passed House Concurrent Resolution 62; but, notwithstanding the fact that nearly 4 months have since passed, no action has been taken by the other body. Not only this but other legislation is being held up in the Judiciary Committee of the other chamber.

In order to effect this investigation, which is desired and much needed, we are bringing in this House resolution. I understand the Senate committee has amended the concurrent resolution in a manner that would only permit the members of the Judiciary Committee of either branch of the Congress to be members of this proposed committee. In view of the fact that both of these Judiciary Committees are extremely busy and already have several investigations under way, I feel that those committees would not be able to conduct this investigation as demanded by the country. Therefore, we are calling up this resolution, with the conviction that the gentleman who introduced the resolution is extremely capable and fair-minded. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN] has the confidence of every Member of this House, and I know that under his chairmanship we will obtain a real and impartial investigation, not only of the business lobbyists but also the gentlemen representing the Federal departments and independent agencies that devote a great deal of their time to lobbying for their legislation. I, and I presume other Members, are aware of the fact that we have certain branches of our Government that spend a great deal of their time and Government money to lobby for legislation to broaden their authority and have opposed the President's requests on reorganization to bring about greater efficiency and economy in the departments. The Corps of Engineers, United States Army, is doing everything in its power to kill reorganization. It even defies orders of the President. The corps has for years carried on a most flagrant lobbying activity. It has had the whole-hearted support of the so-called rivers and harbors bloc, composed mostly of southern Members of the House and Senate. The rivers and harbors congress is stanchly behind the corps in its lobbying activities. They, in turn, tie up with the lobby of contractors and with State and local officials. If you own a swamp in the South and are lucky enough to get the Corps of Engineers to drain it for you, you can sell it at any price you can get—the people of the United States pay the bill. The Corps of Engineers has developed one of the most effective lobbies ever operating on Capitol Hill.

I introduced in several Congresses prior to 1946, resolutions asking for investigations of lobbyists but no action was taken. When the Reorganization Act of 1946 was passed it embodied provisions for the registration of lobbyists. I then said that instead of restricting lobbying, under that reorganization provision, we really legalized lobbying here in the Capitol regarding legislation of special in-

terest to the Departments and outside interests.

I feel that this resolution is timely and should receive the unanimous support of the House. For your information I wish to say that up to now 1,900 lobbyists have registered, though very few of them give the real facts and information as to how much money they are receiving or how many corporations they represent; in fact, the information they give is of very little value to the Members of this House. Consequently, I feel that this resolution should pass.

I have some figures here as to how much some of these professional lobby-

ists have been receiving. I am not going to detain the House with that information, but I am going to insert those facts in the RECORD and embody them in my remarks. I ask unanimous consent to insert the names of some of the outstanding lobbyists, whom they represent, how much they have received, and so forth.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Here is a partial list, picked at random from reports appearing in the RECORD:

Name	Firm represented	Paid	By whom	Expense reimbursement
Wm. F. Bryans.....	Public Service Co. of Colorado.	\$25,000 per year retainer.	By same..	Traveling and miscellaneous expenses.
Fred Hartley.....	Tool Owners Union, Inc., Massachusetts.	\$20,000 per year.....	do.....	Out-of-pocket, office rent, traveling, entertainment.
Edgar S. Idol.....	American Trucking Association.	\$13,500 per year.....	do.....	Ordinary business expenses.
Hill Knowlton, Inc.....	American Butter Institute, Chicago; National Creameries Association, St. Paul, Minn.	\$36,000 retainer, at \$3,000 per month.	do.....	Out-of-pocket, travel, entertainment, postage, etc.
Peyton, Gordon P.....	Association of Cocoa and Chocolate Manufacturers of United States.	\$20,000 annual retainer..	do.....	No expenses.
Reilly, Gerard.....	General Motors, Detroit.	\$36,000 per year.....	do.....	None.

The record shows that in the first quarter of 1949 lobbyists reported a total of over two millions spent—to break all records. The second quarter will exceed the first. It also shows that 258 lobbyists filed reports—another record.

The total of over \$2,000,000 reported is almost \$200,000 more than was reported in the last quarter of 1948—the previous high.

During the first quarter of 1949 Congress was engaged with legislation dealing with Taft-Hartley repeal, housing, minimum wage, increased appropriation for TVA steam plant, national health insurance, and yellow margarine, all of which legislation kept the lobbyists busy.

Below is a partial list of some of the large lobby organizations and their reports of expenditures for the first quarter of 1949:

	Expended
Committee for Constitutional Government.....	\$149,066
National Association of Electric Companies (against Taft-Hartley).....	136,500
National Physicians' Committee.....	130,969
American Medical Association.....	115,243
General Electric Co.....	91,075
National Association of Real Estate Boards.....	39,344
Association of American Railroads.....	33,000
Chamber of Commerce of United States.....	28,000
Southern Pines Industry Committee.....	36,377

The following is a break-down of 258 groups which spent hundreds of thousands in the first quarter of 1949:

Business (building, real estate, finance, food and agricultural products, oil, gas, mining, power, communications, transportation).....	\$952,421
Foreign-policy groups.....	184,020
Farm groups.....	111,079
Reclamation, rivers and harbors groups.....	102,000

In the business group, NAM allocated \$80,019 for the year 1948. Total receipts by NAM for the second half of 1948 were \$2,280,989.

The majority of the large concerns now retain large law firms in Washington and other large cities. In these firms is found a partner influential in Washington because he occupied at one time or other an important Government position.

The compensation these firms receive for lobbying is called a retainer—not lobbying compensation. Hence they do not set forth the amount of retainer or if set forth, is charged as fees for legal services the law firms maintain are not lobbying service. But they are. They write briefs, consult with the companies and corporations they represent—send out material for consumption by the members of the industry and thus directly and indirectly influence legislation.

Some of the evasions by registrants under Public Law 601 are herewith cited:

First. A law firm receives a retainer and each partner shares in proportion to services he renders in connection with its employment.

Second. Registrants claim to act as consultants and claim they do not come under Public Law 601.

Third. Registrants fail to state, at time of filing statements with the Clerk of the House, the compensation they are to receive.

Fourth. Executives of corporations and companies register. They spend most of their time in Washington. However, they claim they are not subject to the act.

Another class of executives state they are paid as executives of the company they represent, and if they do anything to influence legislation only a portion of their salaries are shown as being expended for their lobbying activities. The question is, how much time do they spend

as executives and how much time as lobbyists?

Fifth. Lobbyists in many cases receive expenses from two or more clients for hotel, entertainment, office, and so forth. They should be made to itemize these charges.

Sixth. Form A, which covers "name of contributor and amount of contribution" should be printed in the RECORD. Many do not file this form. There is no check upon these returns, although I understand the Department of Justice looks over these reports.

In the case of an organization such as the National Economic Council, we find in its report such entries as J. J. Raskob (\$500); Nelson, of Sears-Roebuck & Co., and others, giving money to a hate-mongering organization, but I have been unable to find any report by this organization showing the many thousands of dollars they receive in contributions from various other sources.

A civil suit has been brought by the National Association of Manufacturers against the Attorney General to determine the constitutionality of the Lobby Registration Act. This case originated as a result of the request of the Department of Justice to NAM to furnish certain records relative to their legislative activities but they refused to comply. The suit was instituted to determine the meaning of persons as defined in the act. The Attorney General has held that NAM does come under the act and must register and file its statement.

I do not have to tell you how many of these lobbyists there are around this building and the Capitol and the hotels—how many of them have organized publicity offices in the city feeding us a lot of this misinformation and attempting to kill legislation that they dislike and advocating legislation not in the best interests of our Nation.

In view of the fact that many Members desire to leave this afternoon and that I have two other resolutions that I wish to call up before we adjourn, I shall conclude my remarks.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, we have three minor measures here today, and it should not take the House over 5 minutes to pass all three of them. The first one is the resolution about which our distinguished chairman has just spoken, regarding lobbying. Personally, I am not going to offer any objection to this resolution. However, as far as I am individually concerned, may I say that in the long time I have been in Congress, I have not in any instance found any persons trying illegally or wrongfully to influence me in regard to any legislation. I will admit that many have come down here and discussed legislation both pro and con, but I reiterate that in all my years here I have never seen or heard of any individual doing anything that I could possibly construe as being wrongful.

We also have for consideration the bill (H. R. 5526) to authorize the President

to provide for the performance of certain functions of the President by other officers of the Government, and for other purposes. We all know that the duties of the President of the United States are so vast and so many that we would naturally like to help him delegate as many of his administrative functions as possible. However, I think it is extremely important that while we do permit him to delegate certain administrative functions he retain, and we must insist that he retain, the responsibility in respect to all the powers he does delegate. In other words, the delegation of administrative functions is all right, but I repeat that it is necessary that the President be responsible for all the powers he delegates to any department head or other individual.

House Joint Resolution 297, also scheduled for consideration this afternoon, authorizes Federal participation in the International Exposition for the Bicentennial of the founding of Port-au-Prince, Republic of Haiti. The resolution authorizes the expenditure of \$170,000 for a commission to go down there and show our respect for that republic.

I say again, Mr. Speaker, there is no reason why these three measures should not be passed in short time this afternoon. This entire week we have been continuously on the House floor in regard to important legislation. It is of like importance that the membership be permitted, this being a Friday, to go to their offices and take care of their mail.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McSWEENEY].

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my chairman for yielding me this time, and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, at present the Senate is engaged in investigating the activities of certain self-styled management counsellors, or who are more popularly known as "5 percenters." It is my belief that such persons are a result of the lack of adequate and centralized dissemination of information on bids and awards by the various governmental agencies. Government procurement is vast and many small-business men, who cannot afford to avail themselves of the services of high-priced representatives in Washington, have no way of knowing the status of any particular bid that they may have submitted to a Government agency.

Continuing my thought on this timely question of the obtaining of Government contracts by private industry, I would like to say that my suggestion is as follows:

That a small agency be established which would gather from all of the departments and bureaus of the Government regular information as to the needs of these several departments, what materials are to be purchased, and what contracts are to be let. A daily report could be made and printed in booklet

form by the Public Printer. This publication would not only contain requests for material and the call for bids on proposed building programs, but it would also show each day what contracts have been awarded and to whom so that individuals or firms, which had bid on a certain project, would know when it had been awarded and could submit bids on other proposed work. As we all know, the small concerns cannot risk bidding on two or three Government projects at one time because their capacity would not make it possible for them to carry out more than one project at any one time. The regular report of this agency would keep them informed so that they could bid on the different projects as they appear on the record.

This whole program would be entirely self-supporting. The businessmen of the country would subscribe to it gladly because they would have before them constantly, the needs of the Government and all of its ramifications. An initial fund might be necessary to set the program in operation but this would be a revolving fund and would be liquidated by the contributions of the subscribers. Those who join with me in feeling that too often bureaus are set up and become almost self-perpetuating would be relieved of that fear because the moment the businessmen of the country were not willing to support this service, it would automatically be discontinued.

Again, I must repeat that we can all see that the ramifications of a tremendous operation like our Federal Government do, of necessity, create what we call "5 percenters." The small-business men in the several parts of the country would find it cheaper to pay 5 percent to some man to keep them informed on what was happening. However, we can all see that this type of program does lead to discrimination and to injustices and, if carried far enough, to dishonest procedure. My program, which would be embodied in a bill which I shall introduce in the next session of Congress, will entirely eliminate this.

I ask for your friendly consideration of this proposition and hope that when the time comes, it will have your wholehearted support. I am sure it will be welcomed by the fair-minded businessmen, who are trying to find outlets for their products and who are trying to find continuous employment for their employees.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time, since we are considering lobbying investigations, to demand the removal of Tighe Woods, the Housing Expediter. I do so, not only because of what has been revealed concerning his personal conduct, the method by which he obtained his appointment, the influence—sinister influence that was at play in bringing about his appointment—but also because of his actions favoring the realty interests to the detriment of the tenants. He is in the main responsible for the inordinate rises in rents which



are taking place particularly in the city of New York.

On August 1 Mr. Woods issued the following regulation—incidentally this is on top of the regulation with respect to the fair net operating income for which this Congress is responsible and which I opposed. The regulation is as follows:

In considering petitions for adjustments under each of several grounds, the area rent office is directed under the amended regulation to grant increases to compensate for increased cost of operating and maintaining rental housing accommodations since the maximum rent date.

This will mean a landlord who is now receiving as much as a 50 percent or a 60 percent net return, will be entitled to an additional increase in rental.

During the last 3 months there have been 2,400 cases of increases in New York City where rents were raised as much as 35, 37, and 49 percent without having given the tenants a hearing. Under the regulation previously issued by Mr. Woods, tenants are not permitted to question the landlord's figures. They are not permitted to attend the hearing. They are not afforded a hearing and the rentals are increased and made retroactive as well for many months. Tenants have no defender and no protector in Tighe Woods. His actions demonstrate conclusively that he has become the medium through whom greedy landlords exploit tenants—the fountainhead, from which all of these rent increases spring.

The record will show that the office of the Housing Expediter has become an annex to the Real Estate Board. I just wonder what real estate influences are operating on Mr. Woods. Who has his finger in these pies that are being dished out in the office of the Housing Expediter? This is a situation that involves a real thorough investigation.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. May I say to the gentleman that the Real Estate Board, the real estate owners, the great real estate lobby, that has been around here for over 4 years, has spent, according to figures I have been able to ascertain, over \$2,000,000 in the last 3 years, and have brought about legislation under which, unfortunately, Mr. Woods can grant the increases that he has.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes. That is true. The real-estate lobby won a great victory when they got through the fair net operating income legislation. I spoke and voted against the House amendment which later became the fair net operating income language in the bill. This language had the support and approval of the leadership in the House.

However, on top of that, Mr. Woods has gone further. He interpreted the law in such manner as to permit landlords to obtain increases without even giving the tenants an opportunity to be heard. Now he comes up with this other regulation of August 1, which the Congress never intended. I do not believe there is a single member of the Commit-

tee on Banking and Currency who will state that Congress ever intended to give landlords an increase over and above increases they receive under the fair net operating income formula that you accepted here. Yet Mr. Woods sneaks in this new regulation of August 1, which will make it possible for the landlord, who is obtaining a 50- or a 60-percent net income, to get an additional increase.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman one additional minute.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Now, why did Mr. Woods issue this regulation? Who are the selfish influences that brought this about? In view of Mr. Woods' record, in view of the manner in which he obtained his appointment, in view of the fact that he permitted scarce material to be used to build a race track when veterans could not get it to build homes, in the light of the manner in which he has been interpreting the law and issuing regulations, I say he should be summarily removed. I say further that his office should be investigated from A to Z. Let me serve warning on you Members who come from the big cities. What is happening in New York is being repeated in every one of your cities. Your tenants are being fleeced. Rent increases are being given indiscriminately. This Congress gave no protection to the tenants, and here you have a Housing Expediter who goes out of his way to turn his office into a subsidiary of the real-estate interests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to a gentleman who has not been with us a very long time, but whom we all greatly admire, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY].

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the majority leader at this time, who brought out this piece of legislation. It was voted out of our committee to take some of the load from President Truman. I might add that our party, unsuccessfully, last November, attempted to relieve him of all these duties, but since he has them we might just as well make the job a livable one. I think the restrictions that are placed around the authority granted will adequately safeguard the constitutional rights of the office.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, when the Congressional Reorganization Act of 1946 was passed, one of the arguments that was made by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE] and others was that we were going to do away with these special committees. Certain provisions were placed in the act which obligated legislative committees to maintain continuous jurisdiction over legislation which emanated from those com-

mittees. Additional prerogatives and jurisdiction were given to the House Committee on Expenditures in the realm of investigation of governmental agencies in regard to their operating on an economic and efficient basis, and also to see if they were exceeding the authority which the Congress had given to the administrative agencies of government in the executive branch.

It is a hard thing to speak against a resolution like this, and I am not going to vote against this resolution; in fact, I am going to support it because I realize how important it is that this job of work be done. But I want to point out that in setting up this committee, as in the setting up of any other special committee, that the House is, to a certain extent, breaking down one of the primary principles of the Congressional Reorganization Act, which sought to concentrate in committees certain functions, to prescribe certain jurisdictions, and to place with them the responsibility of continued surveillance of the legislation which they pass. This is an instance. Lobbying was part of the Reorganization Act; in my opinion, it comes entirely within the purview of the House Committee on Expenditures. I quote to you subsection (c) of that act which reads:

Evaluating the effects of the laws enacted to reorganize the legislative and executive branches of the Government.

If that does not establish clear jurisdiction I do not know that anything could establish it. So it seems to me that we are in this case taking the wrong action. I opposed the "watchdog committee" the other day because I believed that that particular function should be in the Committee on Appropriations and in the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I thought that anything that could be done by the "watchdog committee" could be done by the Committee on Appropriations or by the Committee on Foreign Affairs investigating the expenditures of money in Europe, or, rather, the administration of the legislation on the ECA. Certainly, if the expenditures of the executive departments go beyond that which is outlined in law, it would come within the purview of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. I believe that we should give this Congressional Reorganization Act a chance to work, and I believe that we should concentrate the functions and responsibilities of each legislative committee within their particular legislative committee. I believe they should have staffs large enough to do the job. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] the other day said that the Committee on Appropriations did not have a staff large enough to cover the functions of the "watchdog committee." The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] was right when he said that if that were true, then the staff of the Committee on Appropriations should be enlarged.

The leadership has seen fit to bring this legislation to the floor, and I realize the importance of it. I think that there should be a complete exposé of all lobbying. All lobbying is not necessarily evil;

lobbying comes under the headings of good and bad; if someone is lobbying for something you support, then it is good lobbying. If it is against something you support, then it is bad. But the over-all effect on legislation in this Nation of the expenditure of millions and hundreds of millions of dollars to influence legislation is certainly a pressing thing that should be looked into. I am, therefore, 100 percent in accord with the purposes of this legislation.

I wish that the function of investigating lobbying had been assigned to the House Committee on Executive Expenditures, which I believe has jurisdiction over the lobbying section of the Congressional Reorganization Act of 1946.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. SABATH. I may say to the gentleman from California that this legislation will in no way affect the jurisdiction of the gentleman's committee. All that is intended is to make the investigation on lobbying and report the findings of the investigation to the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the chairman and the members of the Committee on Rules for reporting this legislation favorably. Public Law 601, Seventy-ninth Congress, title III, covers regulation of lobbying activities.

Pressure groups interpret the Lobbying Act in different ways. Some file expenses. Others file full budget, but list expenditures they judge allocable to legislative activities. Still others file only expenditures directly concerned with lobbying.

Some organizations argue they need not file unless principal purpose is influencing legislation. But Justice Department says, "principal" includes all who have substantial legislative interests. Lobbies also differ on who filed expenditures—organizations or individuals.

The Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act does not spell out whether total budget or the portion of expenses judged allocable to legislative efforts shall be reported, nor has there been a decision on which it is to be used. There is no clear and universally accepted methods of determining how to allocate. The reported expenditure figures, therefore, vary widely as to what they cover.

Some groups simply report the expenses of their Washington office. Others report the whole expenses of various departments and allocate a percentage of publications expense of other departments. Others take a flat percentage of the total as lobbying expense. Some report the salaries of their lobbyists on individual lobbying expense forms and other legislative allocations on the organization expense sheet. Some organizations report that fraction of their publication costs which the legislative contents bear to the whole content. Others do not count their publication costs. Still other organizations do not explain their allocation formula, but give total

expense and the amount allocated to lobbying.

The lobbying law calls for financial accounting of the activities of persons and groups seeking to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress. It therefore does not cover the activities before executive, judicial, or regulatory agencies of the Government. Many organizations, therefore, do not file lobbying expenditure reports, or do not include in their allocations their expenses for commission and departmental work. Those organizations which do not report their entire Washington office expenses, including non-legislative within the terms of the lobbying law, mean noncongressional lobbying in many cases.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### AUTHORIZING PRESIDENT TO PROVIDE FOR PERFORMANCE OF CERTAIN FUNCTIONS OF THE PRESIDENT BY OTHER OFFICERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 311 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5526) to authorize the President to provide for the performance of certain functions of the President by other officers of the Government, and for other purposes. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to commit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this resolution makes in order consideration of H. R. 5526, which would authorize the President to delegate some of his many minor duties and less important functions to other officers of the Government. It is, obviously, physically impossible for him to perform all of the duties now legally committed to his personal attention. Many of them are not of high importance, yet it is necessary for him to devote a great deal of time to them. How in the world, the physical strength of the President allows him to even sign, to say nothing of considering, the multifarious matters that must pass over his desk, I cannot understand.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any opposition to this bill. Since the resolution was introduced by the majority leader, has the unanimous report

of the proper committee, as well as the Committee on Rules, I will not detain the House with a further explanation.

I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time and I know of no opposition on this side.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution. The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution. The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 5526) to authorize the President to provide for the performance of certain functions of the President by other officers of the Government, and for other purposes, be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted*, etc., that the President of the United States is hereby authorized to designate and empower the head of any department or agency in the executive branch, or any other official who is required to be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to perform without approval, ratification, or other action by the President (1) any function which is vested in the President by law, or (2) any function which such officer is required or authorized by law to perform only with or subject to the approval, ratification, or other action of the President. Such designation and authorization shall be in writing, shall be subject to such terms, conditions, and limitations as the President may deem advisable, and shall be revocable at any time by the President in whole or in part.

SEC. 2. The authority conferred by this act shall apply to any function vested in the President by law if such law does not affirmatively prohibit delegation of the performance of such function as herein provided for, or specifically designate the officer or officers to whom it may be delegated. This act shall not be deemed to limit or derogate from any existing or inherent right of the President to delegate the performance of functions vested in him by law, and nothing herein shall be deemed to require express authorization in any case in which such an official would be presumed in law to have acted by authority or direction of the President.

SEC. 3. As used in this act, the term "function" embraces any duty, power, responsibility, authority, or discretion vested in the President or other officer concerned, and the terms "perform" and "performance" may be construed to mean "exercise."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2, after the colon insert "Provided, That nothing contained herein shall relieve the President of his responsibility in office for the acts of any such head or other official designated by him to perform such functions."

Page 2, line 6, after "writing", insert "shall be published in the Federal Register."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to whom was referred the



bill, H. R. 5526, to authorize the President to provide for the performance of certain functions of the President by other officers of the Government, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The purpose of the bill is to lighten the excessive work load of the President of the United States. This will be accomplished by enabling the President to cause other officers of the Government to perform in his behalf functions of the President designated by him.

The bill would authorize the President to delegate in writing, subject to such terms, conditions, and limitations as the President may deem advisable, and subject to revocation in whole or in part by the President at any time, to the head of an executive department or agency, or to any officer whose office requires appointment by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, the performance or exercise of any function (including any duty, power, responsibility, authority, or discretion) vested in the President, unless the statute vesting the function in the President affirmatively prohibits delegation as provided for in the bill or specifically designates the officer or officers to whom delegation may be made.

That the bill, if enacted, would be of assistance to the President is beyond doubt. Of the many hundreds of Presidential duties there are several hundred which he now personally performs. He would be afforded material relief from excessive work load by the enactment of the bill because it would provide a workable and expeditious method for placing the responsibility for the discharge of certain minor functions in other officers of the Government.

I think every Member of this Congress can appreciate the excessive work load that has been placed upon the President, and the toll that it has taken upon him in health and time and in long hours of work to carry out the performance of his duties. I think we can appreciate that our Presidents have broken down to a great extent by reason of the heavy work load. We can appreciate that many of these duties are merely administrative in their nature, but the President under the law is required to perform them. All this bill does is authorize the President to delegate to the head of a department or agency or to an officer whose appointment rests in the President with the advice and consent of the Senate certain duties and functions. This power to delegate is revocable at any time. The bill specifically provides that the President is at no time relieved of responsibility for the acts of his agents.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I think I can see, as perhaps we all can, the advisability of providing authority for an executive to delegate certain functions and duties as a matter of expediting the tremendous

business it is necessary to transact, but what is it this bill will authorize the President to do that he does not have authority to do under the present law?

Mr. DAWSON. Questions have been raised at various times in decisions upon statutes as to whether the President has had power to delegate under the law. This just gives him clear-cut authority to do what many believe he now has the right to do, but where a question has been raised at various times as to his right to do it. It does not give him the right, certainly, to delegate any constitutional powers, because we could not give him that right by law. However, many statutes provided that the President should do certain things. For instance, under the War Powers Act he had to sign the warrant for every officer, and he delegated that duty, but there was some question about it.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman had a lot to do with the formulation and presentation of the reorganization bill to this House. Certainly he is to be highly commended on the very valuable service he performed in the course of his duty as chairman of the committee. May I ask the gentleman if any of the authority under the Reorganization Act which the Congress this year has provided that is delegated to the President could be delegated by the President to someone else in the various agencies?

Mr. DAWSON. My answer to that would be "No."

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAWSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SABATH. Is it not a fact that your committee has had before you witnesses testifying to the need for this legislation, and that your committee has reported this bill out by a unanimous vote?

Mr. DAWSON. That is true. It was reported out of the committee by a unanimous vote, with the reservation by one member of the committee that he had the right to make objections or differ on the floor of the House if he saw fit to do so. The action of voting the bill out was unanimous.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I am in accord with the general idea of this bill, but in order that I may point out to you my slight objection, may I call to your attention the divisions of our Government—the legislative, the executive, and the judicial. The thing that I am concerned about here is whether this bill would give the President power to assign the performance of some of the Executive functions to officials in departments other than the executive department. As this bill is now written I am afraid that is what it will do—it will permit the President of the United States to delegate the performance of some of his functions to heads and officials in other departments of the Government—I mean departments and agencies other than those in

the executive. No amount of arguing can prove otherwise. Let me read to you:

The President of the United States is hereby authorized to designate and empower the head of any department or agency in the executive branch, or any other official, who is required to be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

I say under the wording of this bill the President can designate any judge in the judicial department and assign to him the performance of executive functions. Personally, I feel it would be unwise to confer that power upon the President because it would be in the direction of destroying the theory of our Government and the balance of powers between the three departments. It would confuse the performance of these functions if the President could designate a member of the judicial department to perform executive functions.

He could even go into the legislative department where the official is appointed by and with the consent and advice of the Senate and he could select that individual to administer executive functions. I honestly believe—and I shall offer an amendment at the proper time, that we should strike out the word "other" in line 5; and after the word "official" we ought to insert the word "thereof." Then we would be spelling out in the bill exactly that the President must assign the performance of these functions to a head or official of any of the departments of the executive branch and must not go out of that executive department to select the official who must perform these functions.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAVALCANTE. It is a pleasure to yield to our distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. As the author of the bill I recognize that the gentleman has talked with restraint and very constructively. I recognize there is such a possibility. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me that in the actual operation of this bill there would not be any such delegation. But of course that is not the question. I think the amendment which the gentleman has said he proposes to offer is an amendment which will strengthen the bill because it removes any possibility of uncertainty or ambiguity, and it makes it definite. So far as I am concerned, if the gentleman offers the amendment, and I hope he will, I shall vote for it. It is agreeable to me.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 177]

Abbott	Gorski, N. Y.	O'Neill
Anderson, Calif.	Gossett	Patterson
Andresen,	Green	Pfeiffer
August H.	Gregory	Joseph L.
Auchincloss	Gwinn	Pfeiffer,
Baring	Hall,	William L.
Barrett, Pa.	Leonard W.	Philbin
Bates, Ky.	Harrison	Phillips, Calif.
Beall	Hart	Phillips, Tenn.
Bentsen	Hobert	Plumley
Bland	Heffernan	Poage
Bolling	Heller	Poulson
Bolton, Ohio	Herlong	Powell
Breen	Herter	Quinn
Brooks	Hinshaw	Redden
Buckley, N. Y.	Hoffman, Ill.	Reed, Ill.
Bulwinkle	Hope	Rees
Burdick	Horan	Ribicoff
Burke	Howell	Riehlman
Burleson	Jackson, Wash.	Rivers
Burton	James	Rogers, Mass.
Canfield	Javits	Roosevelt
Celler	Jennings	Sadowski
Chatham	Johnson	St. George
Chesney	Jonas	Scott, Hardie
Chilperfield	Kearney	Scott,
Chudoff	Keefe	Hugh D., Jr.
Clemente	Kelley	Secrest
Clevenger	Kennedy	Shafer
Cole, N. Y.	Keogh	Short
Corbett	Kilburn	Sikes
Coudert	Kilday	Smith, Ohio
Dague	Kirwan	Smith, Va.
Davies, N. Y.	Klein	Staggers
Devis, Tenn.	Lane	Stanley
Delaney	Latham	Taylor
Denton	Lichtenwalter	Teague
Dingell	Lind	Thomas, N. J.
Dollinger	Lovre	Tollefson
Dolliver	Lyle	Towe
Donohue	McGregor	Underwood
Eaton	Doyle	Velde
Fallon	Mahon	Vinson
Fellows	Marshall	Wadsworth
Flood	Martin, Mass.	Weichel
Fogarty	Mason	Welch, Calif.
Fulton	Miles	White, Idaho
Furcolo	Miller, Md.	Whittington
Gilmer	Miller, Nebr.	Wickersham
Gordon	Morton	Wilson, Ind.
Gore	Murphy	Winstead
	Norton	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 284 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### AUTHORIZING PRESIDENT TO PROVIDE FOR PERFORMANCE OF CERTAIN FUNCTIONS OF THE PRESIDENT BY OTHER OFFICERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, though frequently points of no quorum have been made by me, I did not make this particular one. That does not mean that I would not make it had someone else not made it.

There is so much confusion in the House, it may in part be unavoidable, that the other day I noted that the Speaker himself had difficulty not only in hearing what was said but in seeing who was talking. In my humble judgment, the Members of the House should

have at least some little idea of the legislation that is being enacted here from day to day. I hope we can avoid all personalities in the discussion on this bill. For that reason I want it distinctly understood that if during the debate I say something about the head of a department, or if perchance I should name some individual, there will be nothing personal about it. My only purpose is to call attention to the authority of that individual or to the functions which that individual might be called upon to exercise if such are delegated to him by the President.

So far as I know, Mr. Speaker, there is no objection—none whatever—to the purpose of this bill. Everyone realizes that the President cannot perform all the routine duties the Congress has imposed upon a President. What would be a physical impossibility. For my own part I might say that I have no objection if he wants to get some sort of duplicating machine carrying his signature or some mechanical device to stamp with his name all the bills that he must sign, or if he wants someone to perform any of the administrative acts or duties which fall upon him—I have no objection, and I know of no one who has any objection to that burden being lightened by any legitimate way.

But this bill, may I suggest, goes entirely too far. Note—and I wish everyone had a copy of the bill in his hand—the first page gives authority to the President to empower the head of any department or of any agency or any appointive officer whose confirmation by the Senate is necessary to do or to perform any function—get that—to perform any function which it is the duty of the President to perform. So far so good. I have no objection so far. But, then turn to page 2 where we find the definition of the term "function." Here is the language. It begins in section 3 on the last line at the bottom of the second page:

As used in this act the term "function" embraces any duty, power, responsibility, authority, or discretion vested in the President or any other officer concerned.

Could any language be broader in its meaning or scope? Could any language be more comprehensive than that? We are not setting up a dictator by this bill—that is not my argument. What we are doing is permitting the President who is overburdened and overworked to empower any agency head, the head of any department, to do the things and to perform the duties—the discretionary duties—of course, those vested in, or imposed upon, him by the Constitution, we have nothing to do with—to delegate any other discretionary or mandatory duty which is imposed upon him or any act which he is required to do as the head of a department or agency.

I submit that is going altogether too far. If we follow through on the course which is charted in this bill and permit that language to stand, shortly—in spite of the words in the bill which state that the President shall be responsible for

what these gentlemen do—in spite of that language, it will not be long before we will have a lot of little presidents or dictators exercising in an arbitrary manner authority and performing the duties which the Congress has placed upon the President.

Let me repeat—we all realize that some of these duties, in fact many of them, have to be delegated. As a matter of practice many acts are now delegated. Let us not go beyond what is necessary to release the President. Let us consider this illustration, and again let me say there is nothing personal about this.

Suppose we have a strike in the steel industry, as we may have, and the question comes up as to whether the steel industry shall be seized. Under the law as it stands today it is up to the President to decide whether he will ask for an injunction, or perhaps attempt to seize the plant.

The other day the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] called attention to the strike in Hawaii, which has tied up the island. Industry in that island is tied up. Food is short. Harry Bridges, now under indictment, is there, and he says that notwithstanding the legislation which has been passed in the islands for the seizure of those industries, if the Government attempts to operate them, he is going to transfer some of the activities of the strike to the west coast, and he will tie up the west coast. He has been able to do it before and we let him get away with it.

Now, suppose that issue comes up and the President delegates authority over the dispute to the Secretary of Labor, do you see where we are? There is an agency created by statute, to do what? In the words of the statute, "to foster, promote, and develop the interests of the wage earner." What are the interests of the wage earner in connection with that strike in the islands? Shorter hours, higher wages—I do not know what it is. But in any event, whatever be the issue there, whatever be the issue in the steel strike, it would be up to the President, and he might delegate that authority to the Secretary of Labor, whose duty it is to promote the interest of the wage earner as against the interest of the employers, but more important as against the interests of the people of the United States, to determine whether under his duty to promote the interest of the wage earner the industry should be seized and—now get this—held until the employer yielded to the wage earners' demands.

My point is that that authority should not be delegated to the Secretary of Labor, but the probabilities are that it would be so delegated. So when the proper time comes, I will offer an amendment to strike out, at the top of page 3, after the word "embraces", the words "any duty, power, responsibility, authority, or discretion" and insert in lieu thereof "any administrative duty"; or if anyone on the floor has any other words that will more accurately describe my purpose, I am perfectly willing to have those words substituted.



When this matter was before the Rules Committee the other day, I recall that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and perhaps one or two others suggested that the bill was too broad and that we could correct it on the floor. That is my sole purpose. To relieve the President? Yes. But not to permit anyone—that does not mean, as some subsequent speakers will suggest, that I lack confidence in the President. That is not it. It would not make any difference who was President. The amendment might in practice protect the President from ill-advised acts of the heads of an agency or department.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I suggest to the gentleman that the amendment stage is now. I simply make that observation for the gentleman's information.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts, but I thought perhaps, having moved to strike out the last word, then, after some other gentleman had spoken, I might offer the amendment, and by that procedure it might be possible for me to have an opportunity to answer these arguments.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The reason I made the observation was in hopes not to stop the gentleman from getting another crack at it but that he would not take another crack.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is all right, if the amendment could be voted on now without further discussion, but realizing the power of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] to sway the House by his eloquence—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman offer an amendment at this time?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No. I just ask that it may be read at this time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the suggested amendment will be read by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: On page 3, line 1, after the word "embraces", strike out the words "any duty, power, responsibility, authority, or discretion" and insert in lieu thereof the words "any routine administrative duty."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, if I have any.

Mr. MCSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment, as unanimous consent to speak out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

Mr. MCSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the Members of this House the fact that \$85,000,000 have been set aside for production and subsistence loans for the fiscal year 1950 by the Department of Agriculture.

I want to state that I in no way wish Ohio to have unfair advantage over any of our sister States, but from the point of view of population, from the point of view of the contribution we make to the maintenance of our Federal Government, and from the point of view of our desire to help our ex-servicemen and others in their efforts to improve agriculture, I make this complaint.

I think the fallacy of the whole program is that we in Congress predicate a future appropriation or the continuing of an appropriation upon past consumption. In other words, if we have appropriated \$10,000,000 for a project for 1 year and it is not all used, instead of giving credit to the administrator of that fund who is trying to spend it wisely and judiciously, we penalize him by not giving him an equal amount for next year when he may be better prepared to spend the remaining amount plus the new appropriation.

As we know, \$85,000,000 was appropriated for production and subsistence loans for 1950; \$75,000,000 was to be allocated immediately and \$10,000,000 kept in reserve. Because of my interest in Ohio I am making definite reference to that State. I find that it has \$950,000 allocated for this year; that it has \$822,780 available for new loans, but, on the other hand, I find the small States, from the population point of view, such as Mississippi and Oklahoma, each getting over \$3,000,000. To me this is an inequality and an injustice. Ohio's administrators have been trying to conserve this fund and only put it out where they feel it will do the most good. Since 50 percent of this fund was for ex-servicemen, we are trying in Ohio to see that men who have been availing themselves of an education under the GI bill of rights will soon be in a position to receive the benefits of this fund. Therefore, because last year's consumption was small, it is not fair to give small allocation for this year. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. POLK], distinguished member of the Agriculture Committee, also feels that adjustments must be made.

My colleague and comrade, the gentleman from New Jersey, Congressman ROBINO, was startled to find that his State, with its vast truck-gardening programs, was confined to \$525,000. He, too, insists on reconsideration of the allocation.

I in no way want to be too critical of the people who must make the allocations of public funds, but I do feel that it is wrong to predicate future allocations entirely upon past consumption, because, as I said before, it penalizes the careful administrator and encourages unwise and extravagant use of Government moneys. I am respectfully asking that the administrators, who have made these allocations, give reconsideration to them and see if a more equitable program cannot be set in motion.

Many of my comrades of both World Wars are supposed to have one-half of all of this fund. The Ohio boys are going to be severely handicapped if more money is not allocated to Ohio. We real-

ize, too, that the providing of shelter on the farm for animals and equipment costs more than in States of a milder climate. I must insist, therefore, that a reallocation of funds be made.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCSWEENEY. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I invite the gentleman's attention to the fact that on yesterday I introduced a bill to restore the 16,000 veterans' hospital beds that were eliminated recently by Executive order. A large number of them are in the State of Ohio.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCSWEENEY. I yield.

Mr. LESINSKI. I understand there is great demand from the State of Ohio for money for education. Why is it that Ohio has bottled up \$200,000,000 and will not release any money for education?

Mr. MCSWEENEY. I will answer the gentleman this way: We are trying to handle things in Ohio in the way that will be most beneficial for the people who are helped. We have a number of men who are getting ready to make application for farm loans. These men are now in the agricultural colleges. In order not to make unwise loans we are retaining this money so that it may be used judiciously, so that the men may be qualified to use it and so that they will understand that in using it the State wants them to make a success. We in Ohio are trying to make those people who apply worthy people, and we are trying to take care of worth while ex-servicemen who are now getting into the farming business.

Mr. LESINSKI. That money was purposely allocated for education. There are many underprivileged people there who ought to get this money, whom it was expected would be helped by this money, yet the State of Ohio will not release it.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield that I may answer the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. MCSWEENEY. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. I would like to answer the question of the gentleman from Michigan as to why the State of Ohio does not release more money for educational purposes. That is undoubtedly due to the fact that Hon. Frank J. Lausche, our Democratic Governor, and his Democratic-controlled legislature, has the same attitude toward education as has the chairman of our Committee on Education and Labor. That is the answer why no more money was released. And, by the way, let me further explain to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI] that there is no great demand from Ohio for money for educational purposes from the Federal Government.

Mr. MCSWEENEY. There have been bills introduced—

Mr. LESINSKI. But the gentleman has not told us why money was not granted when it was actually made available by a Republican Congress.

Mr. MCSWEENEY. May I say in reply to my colleague that there have been bills introduced in the legislature to do

just that thing. As to the present status of those bills I am sorry I do not know.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MCSWEENEY. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. I wish to further state that I fully answered the question of the gentleman from Michigan as to why more money was not appropriated by the State of Ohio for aid to education. I am in complete agreement with the sentiments of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCSWEENEY] and am only answering the question of the gentleman from Michigan as to why more money had not been appropriated for educational purposes in Ohio. I repeat that if the present Ohio Legislature had authorized more money, especially for certain school districts in the unglaciated area of the State that you would hear no talk from anyone requesting Federal aid in Ohio. We have sufficient money in Ohio to run all State functions as well as education and the present State administration was derelict in its duty by failure to act. Governor Lausche is the first executive in Ohio who ever vetoed an educational appropriation bill. This was during his first term and a Republican legislature overrode him.

Mr. MCSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I was asked to offer the amendment at this time. I offer the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: On page 3, line 1, after the word "embraces", strike out the words "any duty, power, responsibility, authority, or discretion" and insert in lieu thereof the words "any routine administrative duty."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the first line of the title of the pending bill the word "a" be corrected to read "to."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the legislative history of this bill would be clearer if we had some statement by the chairman of the committee as to whom the word "such" refers appearing in line 20, page 2.

Let me read the first sentence of that section:

Sec. 2. The authority conferred by this act shall apply to any function vested in the President by law if such law does not affirmatively prohibit delegation of the performance of such function as herein provided for, or specifically designate the officer or officers to whom it may be delegated.

Then follows the sentence, which reads:

This act shall not be deemed to limit or derogate from any existing or inherent right of the President to delegate the performance of functions vested in him by law, and nothing herein shall be deemed to require express authorization in any case in which

such an official would be presumed in law to have acted by authority or direction of the President.

I have read the paragraph over two or three times and it is not clear that in the second sentence there is any antecedent to determine who "such an official" is. The only way that I can understand it is to assume that the words "such an official" refer back to "officer or officers" in line 15 of the preceding sentence. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if that is correct? Ahead of the words "such an official" in the second sentence no officials are referred to other than the President himself. The phrase "such an official" is meaningless unless that official is described somewhere.

Mr. DAWSON. I do not get the import of the gentleman's question. To me the language is clear. The gentleman is reading beginning on page 2, line 16:

This act shall not be deemed to limit or derogate from any existing or inherent right of the President to delegate the performance of functions vested in him by law, and nothing herein shall be deemed to require express authorization in any case in which such an official would be presumed in law to have acted by authority or direction of the President."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Who is "such an official"?

Mr. DAWSON. Any official who is deemed to act in a delegated power.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I think the gentleman's question is this; is it not? Does such individual refer to an individual to whom the President has delegated power, or does it refer to someone invested with power by law other than this?

Mr. DAWSON. I assume by law.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, which is it?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In the interest of clarity we should understand who is exempted from the requirement of the express authorization by designation in writing set forth in section 1. If "such an officer" refers back to the first part of this section 2, the first sentence, then it is referring to the officials covered by laws in which there is a specific designation of an officer or officers.

Mr. DAWSON. It relates to that language.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If it relates to that language, then it should be clear.

Mr. DAWSON. Yes; it relates to that language.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It refers to an officer or officers designated by law, then, and does not refer to an officer or

officers whom the President may designate.

Mr. DAWSON. That is right.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, as I understand the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] on page 3, it is this: The words stricken are "any duty, power, responsibility, authority, or discretion" and the insertion for those words of "any routine administrative duty."

First, I would like to say that in the definition of the word "function" we have tried to follow the definition which is ordinarily considered the legal definition of the word "function." I think that the gentleman's words suggested there, "routine administrative duty" would be certainly subject to variability of interpretation. What would the words "routine administrative duty" mean? How would you draw the line of delineation between other administrative duties and routine administrative duties? It seems to me that you would open up this whole meaning of a delegated function to words which are obscure and certainly subject to lawsuits and disagreement as to the exact meaning.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I cannot follow that argument, because there are other words in there. The gentleman can make the same argument against any of those words that he is making now. "Routine administrative duties" covers a fairly well-defined field. I do not believe we should quibble about the President's getting rid of some of these duties that are weighing so heavily on him and that are purely in the way of routine, but what I object to is the delegation of powers with respect to the tariff or the reciprocal trade agreements or any of those things that come up, where a great deal of harm might be done.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I think I understand what the gentleman means. If he will allow me, I should like to say this: At the top of page 2 we have put in this provision, "Provided, That nothing contained herein shall relieve the President of his responsibility in office." In other words, such designations as the President makes are not only made clearly, for, as the paragraph provides, "such designation and authorization shall be in writing," and "shall be published in the Federal Register," so Congress immediately has cognizance of it, but such designation "shall be subject to such terms, conditions, and limitations as the President may deem advisable," and he retains the power to revoke that delegation of authority at any time. It seems to me that gives adequate protection to any designation of authority.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California be permitted to proceed for five additional minutes.



The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If the gentleman will yield further, what I am trying to do is protect and relieve the President from any ill-advised acts that some subordinate might do. You put in this bill that the President is responsible, and of course he cannot avoid that responsibility, but at the same time the wider you make the field of his delegation of power the more you subject him to criticism. If this bill had gone far enough to let the President delegate his authority to any of his official family, where would he be now, for instance, with reference to General Vaughan? Here comes the Post this morning and calls upon the President to take action against the general. Right or wrong, that situation exists. I do not want the President to be put in the position of having the power to delegate that discretionary authority or his duty, and then be responsible for what some subordinate may do.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I understand the gentleman's motives, and they are certainly in line with the motives of all of us. We want to do this thing and do it right. We certainly do not want to give the President any powers to which he is not entitled. It still seems to me that the gentleman's words, "routine administrative duties," do not clearly delineate a sphere of activity. They could be very broad in the interpretation of some people and very narrow in that of others. Therefore, I think the words which are customarily used which relate to function and have a meaning in legal terminology should be used rather than the loose, general words of "routine administrative duties."

May I point out one difficulty in determining "routine and administrative duties"? We have in mind that the President will delegate his function, possibly, to the Postmaster General to sign the commissions of postmasters. That is a tremendous duty. I think the testimony showed that sometimes the President had to sign four or five hundred routine papers in one evening, and that he took the papers home to his own bedchamber and worked into the night affixing his signature, which is required by law, to commissions for second lieutenants and higher officers in the armed services. It is obvious that the President cannot, of his own personal knowledge, know each one of these individuals, know his qualifications and know all the things that an individual would have to know to discharge a personal responsibility. He must, therefore, depend upon administrative heads of departments to bring these papers to him after they have been properly screened and put in order, and the people have been given clearance. Then he affixes his signature as is required by law. We feel, too, in the issuance of certain regulations in the departments there are minor regulations and certainly there is a function of discretion on the part of the administrative officer, there is more involved than merely affixing a signature in those cases.

But there are routine functions which have to be done over and over again, required by some law or other. We had testimony that there were something like 1,100 statutory laws which require the President's signature to be attached to documents, the contents of which involved no personal knowledge on the part of the President. He had to take the advice of his administrative officers on them.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Of course I have no objection to having somebody sign the President's name to these papers. That is absolutely clear. He should be relieved of all of this manual labor as much as possible. But do not impose upon him what might follow as a consequence of allowing him to delegate authority so that some subordinate might get him in hot water.

That is not only protecting the people of the United States, but protecting the President.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am in complete harmony with the gentleman's objective, but I think the language used in his amendment is language which is general in scope and susceptible of so many varying interpretations that you would nullify the act.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Then if that criticism is just, since the language of the bill is world-wide and there is no limitation to it at all and the President can do anything, I am willing to accept any other language which you might suggest.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No. I think the limitation at the top of page two limits the functions and the last section clarifies the interpretation of the word "function."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If you object to the words that I have offered, I am perfectly willing to take anything else to accomplish our purpose. You say that we are in accord on that.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I think the bill does accomplish the purpose because it puts the legal definition of the word "function" which has been established over the decades and we use the legal definition and then we have the further limitation by the provision at the top of page two.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM], whose knowledge of the law I am afraid I am in no way able to cope with.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank the gentleman, but I really do not merit such encomium. I would like to ask the gentleman this question. In your definition of powers you sought to give the President full authority, which he should have, and wide discretion inherent in his office.

As I understand the law, there are many cases where a person is authorized to sign the name of the President

thereby relieving the President of the tediousness of writing his name over and over again.

If I understand the full purport of this bill, it was to do that very thing. That was the question which was in my mind.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired. Without objection, the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thank the Speaker.

This is the question which was in my mind—where the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has offered his amendment striking out the words that you have inserted in the bill, his amendment would make the language read "any routine administrative duty." That, in my judgment, would take from the President the discretion which the President has a right to exercise and I wonder if it would be acceptable to the gentleman to amend it in this sense to make it read "any routine administrative or discretionary duty"?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. If you include "discretionary duty", it would certainly, in my opinion, be better than the way the amendment is written, but I still do not believe it is necessary. I would say it would make the amendment better, but I believe the present language of the bill is safer, because I do not know what field you would open up with the two words "discretionary" and "routine." It would seem to me to be hard to try to delineate between the words. Certainly "discretionary power" is as wide as "duty, responsibility, and authority."

Mr. GRAHAM. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. Of course, it is apparent that in defining the word "functions" you have used all the legal definitions under that.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM. As I understand the gentleman from Michigan, it is his statement that that is too wide—giving to the President powers that were not intended. But, by the same token, as I understand his amendment, he is depriving the President of that inherent discretion which he has at all times, and over which we have no control. That is what I am trying to get at.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. However, in this bill we seek to give the President the power to delegate certain functions which he is now prohibited from doing by the general terms of law.

Mr. GRAHAM. You will recall in the days of the Blue Eagle, when it was held the President had gone beyond his functions in delegating too much power. If I properly understand it, the danger may arise because too much power has been given to the President. What you are seeking to do is to limit to that discretionary power that he must use to relieve him of the tediousness and onerousness of his position.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Does not the gentleman believe that the provision at the top of page 2 which says that "nothing contained herein shall relieve the President of his responsibility in office" is

adequate protection in that only a function is transferred and not the responsibility to discharge that function?

Mr. GRAHAM. I agree with the gentleman that that is a direct attempt to avoid the very thing I have suggested. But the question is whether it would not be made absolutely safe by the insertion of these other words.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. COX. Would not the risk involved be such as to make the President extremely cautious in making the delegation in the first instance, and that therefore, no matter what the language may be, we are compelled to depend upon the discretion of the President?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I think the gentleman has brought out a point which is certainly very valid and which we tried to anticipate in the following part of that paragraph when we said that such designation and authorization should be in writing and should be published in the Federal Register.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Speaker, after we analyze this bill, it is a very simple one. I think it is very fine to have inquiries made to bring out any weakness in the bill, as well as the strength of the bill.

As you notice, this bill gives the President—it is not a question of taking away any power from the President and giving those powers to someone else; all powers are to be retained by the President—powers conferred under this statute. The purpose of the bill is to relieve the President of the United States of as much work as possible, so that he can devote himself to matters of policy. The President has complete control at all times. He can delegate or not, in part or in whole; and if he does, he can recall it. There is no irrevocable delegation here. He can recall it in whole or in part.

The way it came about was very simple. I was at the White House at one of the leaders' meetings some few weeks ago, and, talking as we do there, the President referred to a pile on top of his desk and said, "I have got to take that over to Blair House every night and I have to spend about 3 hours going over these things and signing my name. I have to know what I am signing when I sign. Many of the duties imposed upon me I could delegate to others." That is how it grew up. Not that the President suggested anything, but it left the thought in my mind, and I had a survey made by the Coordinator of Information, Mr. Dickson, to find out just what the situation was. We found over 1,100 statutes; I do not know how many more there are, but the General Accounting Office and the Bureau of the Budget found at least 1,100 statutes under which, either expressly or by inference, the President must act. The purpose of this bill is to relieve the President of some of this detail work, but if he does not want to use

such powers he need not do so. He does not delegate the authority to somebody down the line. It is a delegation only to the head of a department or an agency—somebody nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman has pointed out the words at the top of page 2:

*Provided, That nothing contained herein shall relieve the President of his responsibility in office for the acts of any such head or other official designated by him to perform such function.*

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. CHURCH. Let me remind the gentleman that there is another responsibility of the President which must be kept in mind; that is that when on page 3 you turn the duty, power, responsibility, and authority or discretion of the President over to these people it should be suggested—

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman ask his question? What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. CHURCH. Responsibility for failure to act or for the acts of any such heads.

Mr. McCORMACK. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. CHURCH. Why, the point is that when powers are given to the head of a department and you merely excuse the President for his acts, remember that you should hold the President responsible also for his failure to act.

Mr. McCORMACK. We are considering a bill here under which the President has got to do something.

Mr. CHURCH. I call the gentleman's attention to the words at the top of page 2.

Mr. McCORMACK. We are considering a bill under which the President has got to act. We included the words "responsibility," and so forth, suggested by the members of the committee on the Republican side, and we recognize the import of them. I think that when the President delegates under this he does not abdicate or eliminate his responsibility, but we put the language in there expressly so there would be no question about it. Then we also put in the language: "Shall be published in the Federal Register," in order that there be notice given according to the amendment suggested by the minority side of the committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The gentleman just spoke about being down to the White House and seeing a high stack of papers which the President must

sign. Of course, we have no objection to the President's calling on any man named John, Jim, or whoever it is—

Mr. McCORMACK. I know the gentleman's argument on that; he made it in the committee and he has made it here. Let me advise the House further that the committee, as I remember, held three hearings on this. It was suggested by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], at one of the hearings that he would like to have the General Accounting Office consider this. A representative of the General Accounting Office was up there; he had considered it only the day before. But it was a logical and reasonable request and we said "Yes." So the General Accounting Office considered this, because the General Accounting Office is very close to the Committee on Expenditures and it is close to the Congress. The General Accounting Office considered it for over a week, and then they took it up with the Director of the Budget, and they wrote a letter in substance recommending the bill without even the two amendments that the committee adopted. That shows you how careful we were. Furthermore, this bill was reported out by, if I remember right, all the members present but one, and there were Republicans and Democrats present. That is my recollection. I think it is fine to have my friend from Michigan be the devil's advocate. It is a fine thing to be a devil's advocate, but we cannot let ourselves be governed in legislation solely by the view of one who takes the position of a devil's advocate.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will yield for a parliamentary inquiry. That is very complimentary. I want it understood that when I use the phrase that I like a devil's advocate around it is one of the most complimentary characterizations I can make of my friend. If you say I am a devil's advocate at times, I say it is a compliment, because it is a constructive position where exercised constructively.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact the gentleman thinks he is paying me a compliment, I will not ask him to yield further.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. When this resolution came to the Rules Committee on an application for a rule, that committee examined the resolution very critically. I am disposed to think if there could be found any sound reason upon which to turn the application down it would have done so.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sure of that, based upon my own experience with the Rules Committee, and that is said with all respect to the committee.

Mr. COX. It must be remembered that the grant is at the will of the President. He can make it now and retract it later.

Mr. McCORMACK. He has complete control. He cannot delegate any duty especially imposed by law upon it. So we had that in mind. We have specifically provided for that. If any statute says it is the President's express duty, he cannot delegate it. Some people



raised the question that he could delegate the right to sign a law. We know that cannot be done. We inserted all the reservations we could.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would the gentleman from Massachusetts say that during the Eightieth Congress his position was that of a devil's advocate?

Mr. McCORMACK. Do not get me into that, please. There are so many of my good friends here.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I say that in the sense of a compliment.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Is it not true that the burden of the President at the present time is so heavy it has become necessary for some of his subordinates to perform certain of his functions, and that the purpose of this bill is to eliminate any doubt that may rise as to the legality of the performance of those functions by these subordinates?

Mr. McCORMACK. That comes within the purview of the bill.

Let us consider ourselves and how busy we are, then visualize the President of the United States. This bill is going to be a permanent proposition. It is not for a President, a particular one; it covers the office of President. He has complete control. Can you or I imagine any President delegating to any Department or the head of an agency any power or any duty or any act he feels, or if you or I were President that we felt we should perform ourselves?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for one additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HUBER. Is not part of this burden of the President, so far as affixing his signature is concerned, due in part to the fact the Eightieth Congress did not see fit to confirm any postmasters in 1947 and 1948, which added to the burdens of the President?

Mr. McCORMACK. Please do not get me into that. I will allow it to stay in the RECORD, but I am not going to get into that matter. We are all happy here now, even the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If I understood the gentleman correctly a moment ago he stated in substance that by the language of this bill you expressly refuse or did not give the President the authority to delegate power which had been by statute expressly given to him?

Mr. McCORMACK. Expressly imposed upon him.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All right, expressly imposed upon him. But the language here is that you give to him authority to delegate any function which is vested in the President by law.

Mr. McCORMACK. No. At the beginning of section 2 we say:

The authority conferred by this act shall apply to any function vested in the President by law if such law does not affirmatively prohibit delegation.

That means, of course, that anything expressly delegated to the President he must perform by law; that is, that which is imposed by law. He cannot delegate it under this law.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Of course, as to any subsequent acts expressly conferring upon him that duty he might not be able to delegate that authority, but anything that has gone on before this act he certainly could, under the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. At any event, I tried to give the picture. The committee considered it very carefully. It was reported unanimously, except one vote against.

I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] will be defeated. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is a very good one; it is clarifying and makes it definite, and I hope his amendment will be adopted.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Did the gentleman from Pennsylvania offer his as an amendment to the amendment?

The SPEAKER. He did not.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. We are voting simply then on the original amendment.

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan) there were—ayes 42, noes 33.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 114, nays 162, not voting 156, as follows:

[Roll No. 178]

YEAS—114

Allen, Calif.	Anderson, Calif.	Arends
Allen, Ill.	Andersen,	Barrett, Wyo.
Andersen,	August H.	Bennett, Mich.
H. Carl	Angell	Bishop

Blackney	Hare	Nicholson
Boggs, Del.	Harvey	Norblad
Bramblett	Heslerton	O'Hara, Minn.
Brehm	Hill	O'Konski
Brown, Ohio	Hoeven	Pace
Byrnes, Wis.	Hoffman, Mich.	Phillips, Calif.
Case, S. Dak.	Holmes	Pickett
Church	Hope	Potter
Cole, Kans.	Hull	Poulson
Crawford	Jackson, Calif.	Rankin
Cunningham	Jenlson	Reed, N. Y.
Curtis	Jenkins	Regan
Davis, Ga.	Jennings	Rich
Davis, Wis.	Jensen	Sadiak
D'Ewart	Johnson	Sanborn
Dondero	Judd	Scrivner
Ellsworth	Kearns	Scudder
Elston	Keating	Simpson, Ill.
Engel, Mich.	Kunkel	Simpson, Pa.
Feighan	LeCompte	Smith, Kans.
Fenton	LeFevre	Smith, Wis.
Ford	Lemke	Stefan
Gamble	Lodge	Stockman
Gavin	McConnell	Talle
Gillette	McCulloch	Van Zandt
Golden	McDonough	Velde
Goodwin	McMillan, S. C.	Vorsys
Graham	McMillan, Ill.	Vursell
Gross	Mack, Wash.	Werdell
Hagen	Martin, Iowa	Wigglesworth
Hale	Morrow	Wilson, Tex.
Hall	Meyer	Withrow
Edwin Arthur	Michener	Wolcott
Hand	Murray, Wis.	Wolverton
Harden	Nelson	Woodruff

NAYS—162

Abernethy	Garmatz	O'Brien, Ill.
Addonizio	Gary	O'Brien, Mich.
Albert	Gathings	O'Hara, Ill.
Allen, La.	Gorski, Ill.	O'Sullivan
Andrews	Granger	O'Toole
Aspinall	Hardy	Passman
Barden	Harris	Patman
Bates, Ky.	Havenner	Patten
Battle	Hays, Ark.	Perkins
Beckworth	Hays, Ohio	Peterson
Bennett, Fla.	Hedrick	Polk
Biemiller	Hobbs	Preston
Blatnik	Hollifield	Price
Boggs, La.	Huber	Priest
Bolton, Md.	Irving	Rabaut
Bonner	Jacobs	Rains
Bosone	Jones, Ala.	Ramsay
Brown, Ga.	Jones, Mo.	Rhodes
Bryson	Jones, N. C.	Richards
Buchanan	Karst	Rodino
Buckley, Ill.	Karsten	Rogers, Fla.
Burdick	Kee	Rooney
Burnside	Kelley	Sabath
Byrne, N. Y.	Kerr	Sasser
Camp	King	Sims
Cannon	Kruse	Smathers
Carlyle	Lanham	Spence
Carnahan	Larcade	Steed
Carroll	Lesinski	Stigler
Cavalcante	Linehan	Sullivan
Chelf	Lucas	Sutton
Christopher	Lynch	Tackett
Colmer	McCarthy	Tauriello
Combs	McCormack	Thomas, Tex.
Cooley	McGrath	Thompson
Cooper	Mack, Ill.	Thornberry
Cox	Madden	Trimble
Crook	Magee	Underwood
Crosser	Mansfield	Wagner
Davenport	Marcantonio	Walsh
Davis, Tenn.	Marsalis	Welch, Mo.
Dawson	Marshall	Wheeler
Deane	Miles	Whitaker
DeGraffenried	Miller, Calif.	White, Calif.
Doughton	Mills	Whitten
Eberharter	Mitchell	Wier
Elliott	Monroney	Williams
Engle, Calif.	Morgan	Willis
Evins	Morris	Wilson, Okla.
Fernandez	Morrison	Wood
Fogarty	Moulder	Worley
Forand	Murray, Tenn.	Yates
Frazier	Noland	Young
Fugate	Norrell	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—156

Abbitt	Bolton, Ohio	Case, N. J.
Auchincloss	Boykin	Celler
Bailey	Breen	Chatham
Baring	Brooks	Chesney
Barrett, Pa.	Buckley, N. Y.	Chiferfield
Bates, Mass.	Bulwinkle	Chudoff
Beall	Burke	Clemente
Bentsen	Burleson	Clevenger
Bland	Burton	Cole, N. Y.
Bolling	Canfield	Corbett

Cotton	Jackson, Wash.	Poage
Coudert	James	Powell
Dague	Javits	Quinn
Davies, N. Y.	Jonas	Redden
Delaney	Kean	Reed, Ill.
Denton	Kearney	Rees
Dingell	Keefe	Ribicoff
Dollinger	Kennedy	Riehlman
Dolliver	Keogh	Rivers
Donohue	Kilburn	Rogers, Mass.
Douglas	Kilday	Roosevelt
Doyle	Kirwan	Sadowski
Durham	Klein	St. George
Eaton	Lane	Scott, Hardie
Fallon	Latham	Scott,
Fellows	Lichtenwalter	Hugh D., Jr.
Fisher	Lind	Secrest
Flood	Lovre	Shafer
Fulton	Lyle	Sheppard
Furcolo	McGregor	Short
Gilmer	McGuire	Sikes
Gordon	McKinnon	Smith, Ohio
Gore	McSweeney	Smith, Va.
Gorski, N. Y.	Macy	Staggers
Gossett	Mahon	Stanley
Granahan	Martin, Mass.	Taber
Grant	Mason	Taylor
Green	Miller, Md.	Teague
Gregory	Miller, Nebr.	Thomas, N. J.
Gwinn	Morton	Tollefson
Hall	Multer	Towe
Leonard W.	Murdock	Vinson
Halleck	Murphy	Wadsworth
Harrison	Nixon	Walter
Hart	Norton	Weichel
Hébert	O'Neill	Welch, Calif.
Heffernan	Patterson	White, Idaho
Heller	Pfeifer	Whittington
Herlong	Joseph L.	Wickersham
Herter	Pfeiffer	Wilson, Ind.
Hinshaw	William L.	Winstead
Hoffman, Ill.	Philbin	Woodhouse
Horan	Phillips, Tenn.	
Howell	Plumley	

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Towe for, with Mr. Denton against.  
 Mr. Hardie Scott for, with Mr. Keogh against.  
 Mr. Hugh D. Scott, Jr., for, with Mr. Sadowski against.  
 Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Baring against.  
 Mr. Herter for, with Mr. Chesney against.  
 Mr. Hinshaw for, with Mr. McKinnon against.  
 Mr. Dague for, with Mr. Lind against.  
 Mr. James for, with Mr. McGuire against.  
 Mr. Reed of Illinois for, with Mr. Barrett of Pennsylvania against.  
 Mr. Plumley for, with Mr. Breen against.  
 Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Celler against.  
 Mr. Lichtenwalter for, with Mr. Dollinger against.  
 Mr. Macy for, with Mrs. Norton against.  
 Mr. Shafer for, with Mr. O'Neill against.  
 Mr. Short for, with Mrs. Douglas against.  
 Mr. Canfield for, with Mr. Hart against.  
 Mr. Dolliver for, with Mr. Green against.  
 Mr. Jonas for, with Mr. Jackson of Washington against.  
 Mr. Cole of New York for, with Mr. Gordon against.  
 Mr. Fellows for, with Mr. Roosevelt against.  
 Mr. Beall for, with Mr. Heller against.  
 Mr. Case of New Jersey for, with Mr. Gilmer against.  
 Mr. Kean for, with Mr. Fallon against.  
 Mr. Bates of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Gorski of New York against.  
 Mr. Hoffman of Illinois for, with Mr. Klein against.  
 Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. McSweeney against.  
 Mr. Lovre for, with Mr. Ribicoff against.  
 Mr. Miller of Maryland for, with Mr. Murphy against.  
 Mr. Nixon for, with Mr. Heffernan against.

Until further notice:  
 Mr. Whittington with Mr. McGregor.  
 Mr. Mahon with Mrs. St. George.

Mr. Burleson with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Redden with Mr. Gwinn.  
 Mr. Hébert with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.  
 Mr. Gore with Mr. Wadsworth.  
 Mr. Bolling with Mr. Kearney.  
 Mr. Furcolo with Mr. Halleck.  
 Mr. Philbin with Mr. Riehlman.  
 Mr. Brooks with Mr. Coudert.  
 Mr. Donohue with Mr. Chipfield.  
 Mr. Staggers with Mrs. Bolton of Ohio.  
 Mr. Chudoff with Mr. Taber.  
 Mr. Stanley with Mr. Tollefson.  
 Mr. Harrison with Mr. Smith of Ohio.  
 Mr. Rivers with Mr. Eaton.  
 Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Corbett.  
 Mr. Vinson with Mr. William L. Pfeiffer.  
 Mr. Walter with Mr. Phillips of Tennessee.  
 Mr. Wickersham with Mr. Morton.  
 Mr. Winstead with Mr. Kilburn.  
 Mr. Gregory with Mr. Keefe.  
 Mr. Howell with Mr. Horan.  
 Mr. Davies of New York with Mr. Mason.  
 Mr. Flood with Mr. Miller of Nebraska.  
 Mr. Bailey with Mr. Weichel.

Mr. FERNANDEZ changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: Page 3, line 2, after the word "discretion" insert a comma and the words "other than policy-making decisions."

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, there are many of us who, upon studying this section 3, are becoming more convinced than ever that there is entirely too much discretion left to the President in this particular section to divest himself of all power given to him under the Constitution. I am offering this little amendment hoping that we can make this bill more acceptable to the House, and yet do what most of us want to do, and that is to give to the President assistance in his arduous duties.

I hope the chairman of the committee will accept this amendment as a friendly gesture toward helping frame a bill.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DAWSON. I cannot accept the proposed amendment for the reason that it only adds confusion. It does not clarify anything. It is contained in the section which defines the terms used. This certainly adds nothing to the definition of any term and, as a limitation, it will only lay the groundwork for lawsuits. If any power is delegated, that power is used by the person to whom it is delegated, and then if any person came within the influence of that power, who objected to it, he could raise, under the gentleman's amendment, a lawsuit, based upon the fact that it was not a proper use of that discretion. This bill endeavors to give the President the power to delegate certain functions and certain authority and certain duties. This bill keeps in the President full responsibility for the acts of those to whom he delegates the power.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Nevertheless, the chairman will admit to the House, I believe, that this particular section gives to the President the authority

to give to some other official the power to even get us into war, through decisions on matters of extreme importance?

Mr. DAWSON. No, no.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. If the gentleman will study the section, there is unlimited authority in section 3, and why would the gentleman object to simply having the words in here "other than policy-making decisions?"

Mr. DAWSON. It only adds confusion. It will open the ground to lawsuits when powers have been delegated. We even hold the President responsible for his acts and for the acts of the delegates. This will not add anything to it. It will only cause confusion and cause possible lawsuits.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Under the law as written the President might delegate the foreign policy to the Secretary of State; there is no question about that.

Mr. DAWSON. There is nothing to that under this bill. We cannot give the President the right to delegate any duties imposed upon him by the Constitution.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. As the gentleman from Michigan has well stated, and as any of you can see if you will study section 3, the President can divest himself of all foreign-affairs policies and policy-making decisions and give them to the Secretary of State, if he so desires. I hope that the House will agree to this very reasonable limitation of the power in that section.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment is offered to a term contained in the definition, and the only effect it would have would be to confuse the minds of the people about it and to give an opportunity for those who wish to seek some "out" when a power has been delegated to say that it did not come within the limitation. If we do not place the limitation there, then as far as third persons are concerned they are bound by the acts of the person to whom the power has been delegated. If the person who uses that power uses it wrongfully, the President is still responsible under this bill. We have given him the power to do it. We certainly would say that a President would use the same good judgment in delegating powers which would involve him as any common ordinary businessman would use. I would not put such a restriction around an ordinary businessman in the conduct of his business, and certainly I do not think we should put it around any President of the United States, regardless of what party he belongs to. I ask that the amendment be voted down.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) there were—ayes 41, noes 76.

So the amendment was rejected.



Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CAVALCANTE: Page 1, line 5, after the conjunction "or" strike out the word "other" and after the word "official" insert the word "thereof."

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, the amendment is acceptable to the committee. It is a clarifying amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CHURCH: On page 2, line 4, after "of" insert "or for the failure to act of."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that this is an amendment to an amendment that has already been adopted. The amendment should have been offered previously.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is well taken, and is sustained.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard on the point of order? The gentleman from Massachusetts said it is an amendment to an amendment that has already been adopted.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. CHURCH. Does the Chair mean the committee amendment has already been adopted?

The SPEAKER. The committee amendment has already been agreed to.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN) there were—ayes 101, noes 28.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

#### FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 28) entitled "Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens."

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 2877) entitled "An act to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Big Bend National Park, in the State of Texas, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BUTLER, and Mr. MILLIKIN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### APPROPRIATION BILLS IN CONFERENCE

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, what is the rule of the House with respect to the time following which a motion may be of high privilege to move to discharge conferees for failure to report on a bill in conference?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed the time is 20 days after the conferees have been appointed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to make a motion at this time, but I believe attention should be invited to the fact that the Republican minority in the Congress is being wrongly blamed by the President for a filibuster and for the delay on the appropriation bills. The facts are, as I have heard them on the various bills that are in conference, and which have been in conference for more than 20 days, that no filibuster is taking place by the Republican conferees. I am simply stating a fact when I say that if this situation persists and an attempt is made to throw the blame and responsibility on the minority party, that that motion to discharge the conferees will be made.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman will yield, my inference is that that observation was not made with reference to any conferees, but rather to another body.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am not so sure about that. But the facts will be developed in the event that such a motion is made. In any event it would seem to me that the members of the various conference committees, who are responsible for the delay might well take into consideration the fact that they are inviting a motion to instruct or discharge them if this situation continues. There is no reasonable excuse for this delay the fault does not rest with the Republican minority.

#### INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION—FOUNDING OF PORT-AU-PRINCE, REPUBLIC OF HAITI, 1949

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 312, providing for the consideration of the resolution (H. J. Res. 297) authorizing Federal participation in the International Exposition for the Bicentennial of the Founding of Port-au-Prince, Republic of Haiti, 1949, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 297) authorizing Federal participation in the International Exposition for the Bicentennial of the Founding of Port-au-Prince, Republic of Haiti, 1949. That after general debate which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the

joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order House Joint Resolution 297. It provides for participation by the United States in the International Exposition for the Bicentennial of the Founding of Port-au-Prince, Haiti, and authorizes an appropriation of \$170,000. Further, it authorizes the Secretary of State to appoint a commissioner and deputy commissioner, with approval of the President, to represent the United States.

This proposal is nothing new. We have in the past invariably appropriated various sums of money for national and international expositions; and I feel that our Nation should participate in this exposition the same as other countries are to participate, especially since Haiti is part of Pan America. The resolution permits the construction of some necessary buildings, and the total expenditures are restricted to \$170,000, as I have said.

I do not see how we can decline to participate, because nearly all other countries have shown their interest and will participate. I understand they have appropriated reasonable sums for the erection of various buildings there to be fittingly comport with their prestige and dignity. Consequently, I feel, especially in view of the fact that the proposed legislation has been unanimously approved by the great and conservative Committee on Foreign Affairs after careful consideration, that the rule should be adopted and the bill passed.

I reserve the remainder of my time and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In line 12, on page 2, this commissioner receives \$12,000 per annum. How long does he stay in office?

Mr. SABATH. Oh, until the exposition is over, and that will be about a year, because the exposition will be in 1949 and 1950. It would be necessary to come back to Congress for additional money, of course. We can limit tenure by not appropriating more.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is there any termination date, when he is out and does not get his \$12,000 any longer?

Mr. SABATH. No doubt he will not be entitled to any compensation when his duties are over. His duties will continue only during the time he is supervising appropriate facilities for our proper participation in this happy event and during the time the exposition is operating. I think we may safely say that the job will not be unnecessarily prolonged simply to provide fictional work at public expense.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What year? Will the gentleman tell me that?

Mr. SABATH. It starts late this year and concludes relatively early in 1950, as I am reliably informed.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. 1950?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No longer?

Mr. SABATH. No longer.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not see anything limiting it to 1950.

Mr. SABATH. Well, it is provided on the first page that "there is to be held in the city of Port-au-Prince, capital of Haiti, during the years 1949 and 1950." So I presume that applies to his time of service and also his compensation.

Mr. Speaker, does anybody of the minority desire any time in opposition?

Mr. MICHENER. I have no requests for time.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order to consider Senate Joint Resolution 79 in lieu of House Joint Resolution 297, and that the same may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas there is to be held in the city of Port-au-Prince, capital of Haiti, during the years 1949 and 1950, a world fair commemorating the bicentennial of the founding of Port-au-Prince; and

Whereas the United States has been formally invited by the Republic of Haiti to participate in this exposition; and

Whereas the Republic of Haiti and the city of Port-au-Prince have provided a site and permanent public improvements at an estimated cost of \$4,000,000; and

Whereas such international exposition and celebration are worthy and deserving of the support and encouragement of the United States; and the United States has aided and supported such expositions in the past: Therefore be it

*Resolved, etc.,* That the President is hereby authorized, in his discretion and upon the recommendation of the Secretary of State, to appoint or designate a commissioner, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to represent the United States in connection with participation in the Port-au-Prince Bicentennial Exposition who shall serve for such period prior to such exposition as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution, for the duration of such exposition, and for not more than 6 months after the official closing thereof. The Secretary of State may delegate to the commissioner any authority conferred upon him by this joint resolution, and the commissioner shall be responsible to the Secretary of State in carrying out his duties. The commissioner shall receive compensation at a rate not to exceed \$12,000 per annum while serving in this capacity, except that any official of the Government designated as commissioner shall serve without additional compensation.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized—

(a) to designate as deputy commissioner a Government official, who shall serve with-

out additional compensation and whose duties shall be prescribed by the commissioner;

(b) to secure, either by direct hire or by detail from Government agencies with the consent of the heads of such agencies, such other staff as may be necessary to assist the commissioner;

(c) to erect on land which shall be conveyed in full ownership of the United States of America by the Haitian Government such a building or such a group of buildings as he may deem adequate for effective participation by the United States in the exposition: *Provided, That*, after the close of the exposition, such land and building or group of buildings shall be utilized or disposed of in accordance with the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926, as amended;

(d) to contract with the Port-au-Prince Exposition authorities or with any other person or persons for the design and erection of such building or group of buildings;

(e) to maintain such building or group of buildings and the site thereof and to arrange and maintain exhibits and assign space therein and thereon; and

(f) to accept from any source and to use for the purposes designated—

(1) contributions in money to aid in carrying out the purposes of this joint resolution, which contributions shall be placed in a special-deposit account and any unused portions thereof returned to the donors upon the close of the exposition or upon the cessation of United States participation therein; and

(2) contributions of material or aid in the preparation of the exhibits.

Sec. 3. The head of any establishment, department, or agency of the Government is authorized, on request, to assist the Department of State or the commissioner in carrying out the functions authorized by this joint resolution, including the furnishing of personnel, the procurement, installation, and display of exhibits, and the loan to the exposition authorities of articles, specimens, and exhibits for display.

Sec. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of State, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$170,000 to remain available until expended for the purposes of this joint resolution including: The salaries, allowances, and expenses of the commissioner and such staff as may be required; personal services in the District of Columbia or elsewhere; without regard to civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; employment of aliens; transportation of things; travel expenses without regard to the standardized government travel regulations, as amended, and the Travel Expense Act of 1949; payment of rentals in advance; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); printing and binding without regard to section 11 of the act of March 1, 1919 (44 U. S. C. 111); official cards; entertainment; purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; stenographic reporting and other services by contract or otherwise; rental of offices and quarters by contract or otherwise without regard to the provisions of section 322 of the act of June 30, 1932 (40 U. S. C. 278a); ice and drinking water; insurance on exhibits; such expenditures as may be necessary for the purpose of obtaining, preparing, maintaining, and disposing of exhibit materials; for the construction of a building or group of buildings and the payment of any expenses incurred in connection with the employment of architects and engineers in connection therewith, including payment of their necessary travel expenses, and for the maintenance of such building or group of buildings and their site and grounds; and such other expenses as may be deemed necessary by the Secretary of State to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution; all without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41

U. S. C. 5). Funds authorized to be appropriated herein may be transferred to any executive department or independent office or establishment of the Government with the consent of the heads thereof, for direct expenditure for any purposes of this joint resolution which the Secretary of State may specify.

Sec. 5. The Secretary of State shall transmit to the Congress within 6 months after the close of the exposition a detailed statement of all expenditures together with such other reports as he may deem proper, which reports shall be prepared and arranged with a view to concise statement and convenient reference: *Provided, That* this provision shall not be construed to waive the submission of all accounts and vouchers to the General Accounting Office for audit or to permit any obligations to be incurred in excess of the amount authorized to be appropriated herein.

Mr. SMATHERS (interrupting the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with, but that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, as has been explained by the chairman of the Committee on Rules, this is a very simple bill. It authorizes the United States to participate in this bicentennial exposition in Haiti and authorizes the appropriation of \$170,000 to build a building at Port-au-Prince for this purpose. The building will be used by the Embassy after the exposition has come to an end. Twenty-two other countries are participating in this exposition. There is much precedent for our doing so. Nine times in the past few years the Congress has authorized United States participation in similar expositions. There is every good reason why we should participate in this one. We, as a country, have \$50,000,000 of investment in Haiti and we believe it is to the best interest of the United States that the United States participate in this exposition, and that is why the Foreign Affairs Committee urges your approval of this resolution.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I wish first to answer the gentleman from Michigan as to the time limit which the Commissioner can serve. The Senate bill, which we have substituted for the House bill and which is now under consideration, contains a limitation that the Commissioner shall not serve longer than 6 months after the exposition has ended.

I now yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman tell the House how much this building is going to cost and what the over-all appropriation will be including the salary of the Commissioner and his staff?

Mr. SMATHERS. One hundred and eighty-two thousand dollars, including the salary of the Commissioner.

Mr. STEFAN. Does that include the cost of the building also?

Mr. SMATHERS. Yes. The land is given to us by the Haitian Government.



Mr. STEFAN. Then, the entire overall cost including the salary of the Commissioner and his staff and including the cost of the building will be not over \$182,000.

Mr. SMATHERS. Yes. The staff of the Commissioner will be taken from the State Department employees so there will be no additional appropriation needed for salaries of employees.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, the advice from home is to the effect that the people approve the recommendations of the Hoover Commission on the theory that those recommendations, if enacted into law, will give us economy and efficiency. They not only approve, they demand economy. Yesterday we heard a great deal of talk from the floor about following the Hoover Commission's recommendations. We are hearing from all sources about economy. When will we start on the economy program we have all promised? The amount contained in this bill is small; if the Commission goes out of office when it is contemplated that it will, it amounts to but \$182,000.

A few days ago the press carried the statement that during the month of July of this year we went into the red a billion and a half, or some such figure. This morning's press carried the statement that a bill was coming out of the Civil Service Commission giving Federal employees more money.

Now, that is the usual procedure, while we are all talking economy and while I assume we are all writing back telling our folks that we are going to economize, we do not start on any economy program. Our acts just do not make sense. Congress talks economy. Its acts give the country waste and deficit spending. What is troubling me and a lot of people in my district, and the people of other districts—and they are very insistent that we give them a reason—yes; and just the other day we gave the veterans something like \$112,000,000 or \$120,000,000, in addition to all the other money we have appropriated for them in the fact that we promise one thing and do the opposite. And, by the way, Collier's a week or more ago carried a very concise statement showing the amount of money that had been appropriated for the veterans; yes, and now the post-office people are insisting that they get a raise. What is worrying me is how long will the Congress continue to vote to give billions of dollars to people in other countries while I have to vote against appropriations for this group, that group, and the other group here at home upon whose votes I depend for election in order that we will not overnight slip into a depression. How long can a few of us carry the economy ball, but continue to go along with that kind of deficit spending? That is what is bothering me. Should I join the give-away boys who always speak on the floor for and vote every appropriation requested by a pressure group? I am growing just a little tired of all this loud, continuous economy talk and the vote which, day following day, increases

the national debt. I like to be consistent, I like to vote for a principle, but I am getting terribly tired of voting with a very, very small minority, just a few, willing to resist pressure vote to cut down expenses. I realize when I do that—follow that course—I am incurring the ill will of some of the people who elect me while other gentlemen in this House are getting the good will and the support, Mr. Speaker, first of this group, then of the other group. I am getting tired of it. I would enjoy seeing a few more vote as they talk.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

House Joint Resolution 297 was laid on the table.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LENA MAE WEST

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1285) for the relief of the legal guardian of Lena Mae West, a minor, with Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: MESSRS. BYRNE of New York, DENTON, and JENNINGS.

HARRY WARREN

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1505) for the relief of Harry Warren, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$1,212" and insert: "\$576."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. W. GREENWOOD, JR.

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1137) for the relief of J. W. Greenwood, Jr., with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 9, strike out "\$718.23" and insert: "\$615.41."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. DOROTHY VICENCIO

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 631) for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy Vicencio, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 2, line 4, strike out "truck. No" and insert "truck: *Provided*, That no part of the amount provided for in this act shall be subject to any claim for reimbursement to any insurance company or compensation insurance fund which may have paid any amount to the claimant herein by reason of the death of Raymond Vicencio: *And provided further*, That no."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BREINIG BROS., INC.

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1604) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Breinig Bros., Inc., with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "for" and insert: "from."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLAIMS OF THE CITY OF NEEDLES, CALIF., AND THE CALIFORNIA-PACIFIC UTILITIES CO.

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 559) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Central Division of the Southern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the city of Needles, Calif., and the California-Pacific Utilities Co., with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 7, after "1941" insert: "Provided, That the passage of this act shall not be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the Government of the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

#### SALARIES OF TEACHERS

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I am informed that there is a movement on foot to try and obtain 13 signatures of members of the Committee on Education and Labor in order to try and force a bill out of our committee which would appropriate a certain amount of money and earmark it specifically for increasing the salaries of teachers in the public schools in the various States. Now I am 100 percent in favor of teachers receiving a decent living wage. However, I have it on very reliable authority, in fact from the highest legal authority available that such a move would positively be unconstitutional. The Supreme Court has previously ruled that the Congress does not have authority to appropriate money and earmark it to raise the salaries of anyone who receives his money directly from the State. That ruling was handed down by the Court regarding a test case involving civil-service employees. I was also informed that it would apply to teachers within the various States. It would therefore seem that there is no use to talk about it, because if our committee did bring it out, it would not be germane.

We could appropriate money to the State treasurer or the Ohio Educational Association, and they could use it for any specific purpose permitted under State law but we are not specifically permitted to earmark it by saying that this money may only be used to raise school-teachers' salaries within the State.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALLEN of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include communications.

Mr. BURDICK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include extraneous matter.

#### LOAN EQUIPMENT TO THE BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 3942) to authorize the Secretary of Defense to lend certain Army, Navy, and Air Force equipment to the Boy Scouts of America for use of the Second National Jamboree of the Boy Scouts.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That (a) the Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized, under such

regulations as he may prescribe, to lend to the Boy Scouts of America, a corporation created under the act of June 15, 1916, for use at the Second National Jamboree of the Boy Scouts to be held during the period beginning June 30, 1950, and ending July 6, 1950, at Valley Forge Park, Pa. in celebration of the fortieth anniversary of the founding of the Boy Scouts of America and as the culmination of their crusade to "Strengthen the Arm of Liberty," such tents, cots, blankets, commissary equipment, flags, refrigerators, and other articles of equipment as may be necessary or useful for the accommodation of the approximately 40,000 Scouts and officials who are to attend such jamboree.

(b) Such equipment is authorized to be delivered at such time prior to the holding of such jamboree, and to be returned at such time after the close of such jamboree, as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of Defense and the National Council, Boy Scouts of America. No expense shall be incurred by the United States for the delivery and return of such equipment.

(c) The Secretary of Defense, before delivering such property, shall take from the Boy Scouts of America a good and sufficient bond for the safe return of such property in good order and condition, and the whole without expense to the United States.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, this bill has received the unanimous approval of the Committee on Armed Services. The report was submitted by the gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON], who introduced an identical measure and who is entitled to the bulk of the credit for this legislation.

I am sure the Members will be glad to give approval to this bill making possible the use of needed Army equipment by the Boy Scouts of America next year in their fortieth anniversary jamboree at Valley Forge Park.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on Monday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BIEMILLER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

#### SCHOOL HEALTH PROGRAM

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for the floor today to express surprise and considerable anger over a new campaign that has suddenly developed against the school-health bill. During the past 3 days I have received a series of telegrams and letters in opposition to the bill, and I know that other Members of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee have received identical messages. They come from State medical societies in Washington, Colorado, Maryland, Florida, and New York.

Behind those societies stands the American Medical Association which I feel is going out of its way shamefully in lobbying against the health of America's children.

The bill now under this new and strange attack is the national school health services bill, H. R. 3942. It was introduced by my colleague, Representa-

tive PRIEST, and identical bills were introduced by myself and the following Democrats: Representatives BOLLING, BUCKLEY, DAVIES, HAYS, KLEIN, LINEHAN, MACK, MITCHELL, O'BRIEN, O'HARA, WOODHOUSE, and my distinguished colleague on the other side of the aisle, Representative COUDERT.

The bill calls for an appropriation of \$35,000,000 on a matching State basis to implement the present inadequate school health programs.

As you all know, we have had school health programs for some years. There is nothing unusual in the attempt to protect the health of American children, and the school is the logical place to check on children's health. Nor is there anything revolutionary about Federal grants-in-aid. They are given to the States for roads, for protection against forest fires, for land-grant colleges, and other worth-while purposes.

Although we have some programs now, there are shocking figures to show that the present facilities for school health services are grossly inadequate.

The United States Children's Bureau estimates that three-quarters of the Nation's children need dental care. One-third need medical care. Ten million school children have defective vision. One million have poor hearing. Another 6,000,000 are believed to have diseased tonsils or adenoids, a condition which often leads to deafness.

The recent war brought into sharp focus the need for action on a health program for the Nation's children. In advocating passage of a similar bill in 1944, designed to enlarge the school health program through Federal aid, the Surgeon General of the United States said:

The prevalence of physical defects at selective-service age, defects which in many instances existed in childhood and youth, indicates that school health programs have not been as effective as they might be, both in discovering defects and in following through to assure that appropriate corrective measures are taken.

The Surgeon General went on to say that—

Careful periodic examinations, together with adequate follow-up and correction in the schools and high schools of the Nation are the best insurance a community can have against a repetition of the situation the Nation faced in this war when 40 to 50 percent of the young men were found physically unfit for general military service.

H. R. 3942 seeks to accomplish exactly this purpose. It is designed to implement the present school health programs through Federal aid to protect more effectively American children.

But, suddenly, out of the blue, the American Medical Association is pushing an intensive campaign against it.

I personally am astonished at this flagrant attempt of the AMA to defeat this legislation. That is why I bring the matter up on the floor today. I think the American Medical Association has gone one step too far. Are we going to have to fight the AMA on every piece of legislation affecting health? Even children's health? Is this why the AMA has hired the high-powered publicity firm of Whitaker & Baxter at \$100,000 a year—to deprive schoolchildren of health services?



For the AMA to oppose the over-all health bill was bad enough. But to turn their high-priced lobby on the school health bill is infinitely worse. And it will gain them no sympathy nor support from anyone who is interested in trying to assure adequate health protection for our children.

I already mentioned that there are State health programs in existence now. Would the AMA destroy these too? Would it take away the hearing aids provided by the State of Michigan through its school-health program? The State of Michigan, by the way, has already passed enabling legislation in anticipating the passage of the pending Federal law. Would it stop the dental-carries control programs in the State of Massachusetts? There is a school-health program in North Carolina which is developing its services—training teachers so they will be more aware of children's health needs. In Ohio, hearing and vision conservation programs are being developed with the State assisting local health and education departments in training workers to make tests of school children. The State of Maine is assisting in a demonstration school health project. Florida, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Oklahoma, Wisconsin, Arkansas, and many more States are trying to protect their children through school-health services. The trouble is that these are only beginnings. They need Federal aid if the job is to be done right and extended to additional areas.

I do not know what brought on this campaign of opposition by the AMA at this time. Surely they would not want the existing school-health programs abolished.

There has been little opposition to the national school health services bill. The AMA did testify against certain parts of it during the House hearings. But the bill has wide support throughout the country. Because here is a bill which provides for the development of school health services, which includes all school children, regardless of race, color, creed or nationality. It would extend the State's present school health programs from a mere diagnosis to a program providing diagnosis and treatment "with special reference to the correction of defects and conditions likely to interfere with the normal growth and development and educational progress of children." And here I would like to point out the necessity for providing treatment. Records of a series of health examinations show that out of 200,000 children having dental defects in one examination only 36,000—or 1 in 5 had had their teeth fixed by the time of the next examination. Barely 5 percent with diseased tonsils had had them removed after the first examination. And only 14 percent after the third examination.

The arguments against this part of the bill seem to center around the section permitting States which give treatment to all children to continue doing so. Does the AMA expect doctors to stop vaccinating during an epidemic to ask each child "can your father pay for this?" Are children supposed to deposit

a penny in the slot before they are allowed to receive a fluoride treatment? Are we to dissipate the appropriation called for in the bill in order to determine who can pay and who cannot? The funds spent on improving child health will more than justify those who perhaps could afford to pay who may be included.

The Senate has already approved an identical bill. It is sponsored by the entire membership of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, plus Senator SALTONSTALL. Senators TAFT and DOUGLAS did much of the spade work on the bill. It was passed without a dissenting vote on April 29 of this year. Committee hearings have been held on the House side and a favorable report is expected next week. Now, at the last minute, the AMA jumps into the picture in order to create confusion.

The telegrams I have received are indicative of such confusion tactics. Some are just blunt one-line messages stating "we are opposed to passage of school health bill." The powerful AMA lobby should know better than that. It would have been courteous to say why the senders are opposed. Others, from persons who seemingly have read the bill, or at least have been informed in part of its provisions, go into a little fuller explanation on their grounds for opposition.

One telegram asks me to oppose the bill because it "regiments a child's life." Does school vaccination regiment a child's life? If it does, that is something new to me.

Another medical society is against the bill because of the advisory committee recommended in H. R. 3942. The sender says the bill "requires that no members"—of the committee—"be a physician." This is wholly incorrect. The Federal Security Administrator will administer the program from plans drafted jointly by the State educational and health agencies. Surely State health agencies have at least one physician.

Another is just plain stupid. It reads: School health bills as now drawn will not, repeat not, accomplish purpose of improving child-health services. Federal control in administration of these bills is harmful. Congress should lay down broad general controls with proper audit of funds.

Needless to say, this particular State medical society does not want the bill. But what it wants, I do not know, because the bill does exactly what the wire asks for.

I do not intend to go into further detail about the need for this bill. When this bipartisan measure is reported out of committee, I urge that it be favorably acted upon during the present session. We cannot discriminate against our children. We must increase the health services for America's 45,000,000 children, to correct physical and mental defects which, in many cases when treated early in life, can assure millions of a healthy and productive adulthood.

We must not permit the American Medical Association to lobby America's children out of this right.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I am delighted to yield to my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman has made a very thorough study of the question of public health and has manifested an intense interest in this highly important phase of the health and welfare of the children of the country. The gentleman is a member of the subcommittee which sat and heard testimony and then, in the consideration of the executive sessions of the committee, has had the benefit of the discussion among the members. Could the gentleman advise the House whether or not at the convention of the American Medical Association recently held at Atlantic City there was adopted a resolution in opposition to this proposed legislation which the gentleman has discussed?

Mr. BIEMILLER. My latest information is to the effect that a resolution was presented, and with no discussion, was carried by a voice vote, opposing this legislation. But if I may add to that, in the hearings held before our committee, the American Medical Association sent a representative to testify. He stated that the American Medical Association was opposed to one section of the bill, the permissive section, which permits existing State health plans to carry on the provisions for treatment for all children, not just indigents, a provision that has been put into the bill to maintain State rights, because in many States such plans are now in effect. The drafters of the legislation and the supporters of it certainly do not want to be in the position of forcing a State to change existing plans.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman has had a great deal to say, and I am sure justifiably so, from the information that has come to him, about the American Medical Association being in opposition to this legislation. Am I correctly informed that they had a representative to appear before your subcommittee, which is our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to express opposition to paragraph (C) of section 6 of the bill, and only that part of the entire legislation?

Mr. BIEMILLER. I believe that is the correct number.

Mr. HARRIS. But that was the only section of the bill that the AMA opposed before the committee, is it not?

Mr. BIEMILLER. The AMA representative also inferred that he thought there were not proper safeguards placed upon what he chose to call "too much Federal control," but on rereading the bill and upon discussion in the committee, the representative of the AMA could not show us where there are any rigid Federal control over State plans in the bill. We particularly pointed out to him that proper appeal provisions were in the bill, in case there was any doubt about the matter.

Mr. HARRIS. I dislike to impose upon the gentleman, but would he yield further?

Mr. BIEMILLER. Yes; I will be delighted to yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I have understood, at least the information has come to me that because of the fact there has developed a keen dissension and controversy in the Federal aid to education bill, that through this measure, public health service to the children, that phase of the controversy regarding the religious angle might in some way be minimized. Could the gentleman tell us whether or not there is any basis for that contention, and, if so, is there any connection with the delay in the consideration of this measure, due to the fact that there has been considerable delay and speculation, and perhaps doubt, as to whether there will be any Federal aid to education legislation during this session of Congress?

Mr. BIEMILLER. Obviously, the gentleman has asked a question that could only be answered in about a 5-hour speech, but I am happy to comment, particularly on the first part of his question.

In my humble opinion, the question of school health services is not a matter of Federal aid to education. H. R. 3942 and its companion measures are designed to give health services to children. The reason we chose to make this legislation a school health bill is that it is obviously easier to get groups of children together in the schools than in any other place. As a result, the schools are chosen as the place where physicians and other health technicians, dentists, and so forth, can examine the children and recommend what should be done for them. It is much more efficient and economical. It is for that reason that the bill is drawn to use the schools as the locale in which the examinations of children shall be made. It also draws upon previous experience from plans now functioning in many States, that these techniques are successful and have been very useful indeed.

Furthermore, in most States, even in those States that carry a strict provision against the use of public funds for parochial or private schools of any sort; in those States there has never been any objection made to school health services given to all children regardless of attendance at public or private schools, and this bill is drafted in that spirit. We want to protect and preserve the health of all our children.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McGRATH (at the request of Mr. BYRNE of New York) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper clipping.

Mr. HOLFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include the script of a radio broadcast he made and two editorials.

Mr. BOYKIN (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD) was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. PACE, for the week of August 15, on account of important business;

To Mr. CHESNEY, for Friday, August 12, on account of official business.

To Mr. LOVRE (at the request of Mr. CASE of South Dakota), on account of the serious illness of his father;

To Mr. VINSON, for the week of August 15, on account of important business.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1892. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Lake County, Mont., a patent in fee to certain Indian lands;

H. R. 1997. An act to authorize the survey of a proposed Mississippi River Parkway for the purpose of determining the feasibility of such a national parkway, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2197. An act to authorize acquisition by the county of Missoula, State of Montana, of certain lands for public-use purposes;

H. R. 2740. An act to authorize the establishment of fish hatcheries in the States of Georgia and Michigan; to authorize the rehabilitation and expansion of rearing ponds and fish cultural facilities in the States of New York and Colorado; to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to undertake a continuing study of shad of the Atlantic coast; and to amend the act of August 8, 1946, relating to investigation and eradication of predatory sea lampreys of the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4510. An act to provide funds for co-operation with the school board of Klamath County, Oreg., for the construction, extension, and improvement of public-school facilities in Klamath County, Oreg., to be available to all Indian and non-Indian children without discrimination.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on August 11, 1949, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 91. An act to provide for a research and development program in the Post Office Department;

H. R. 242. An act to provide for the conferring of the degree of bachelor of science upon graduates of the United States Merchant Marine Academy;

H. R. 579. An act to permit the motor vessel *FLB-5005* to engage in the fisheries;

H. R. 607. An act for the relief of Harvey M. Lifset, formerly a major in the Army of the United States;

H. R. 637. An act for the relief of Mrs. Harriett Patterson Rogers;

H. R. 691. An act for the relief of Lawrence Fontenot;

H. R. 748. An act for the relief of Louis Esposito;

H. R. 1017. An act for the relief of John Aaron Whitt;

H. R. 1023. An act for the relief of Lois E. Lillie;

H. R. 1034. An act for the relief of the Jansson Gage Co.;

H. R. 1055. An act for the relief of Agnese R. Mundy;

H. R. 1069. An act for the relief of Albert Burns;

H. R. 1075. An act for the relief of Harry C. Metts;

H. R. 1154. An act to provide authorization for additional funds for the extension and improvement of post-office facilities at Los Angeles, Calif., and for other purposes;

H. R. 1282. An act for the relief of Mrs. T. A. Robertson;

H. R. 1459. An act for the relief of E. Neill Raymond;

H. R. 2925. An act for the relief of Ida Hoehsel, executrix of the estate of John Hoehsel;

H. R. 2931. An act to provide for the conveyance by the United States to Frank C. Wilson of certain lands formerly owned by him;

H. R. 3139. An act for the relief of James B. DeHart;

H. R. 3193. An act for the relief of Public Utility District No. 1, of Cowlitz County, Wash.;

H. R. 3408. An act for the relief of Opal Hayes and D. A. Hayes;

H. R. 3461. An act for the relief of Lester B. McAllister and others;

H. R. 3501. An act for the relief of Nelson Bell;

H. R. 3511. An act to declare the waterway (in which is located the Brewery Street Channel) from Brewery Street southeastward to a line running south thirty-three degrees fifty-three minutes thirty-six seconds west from the south side of Chestnut Street, at New Haven, Conn., a nonnavigable stream;

H. R. 3756. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to provide that the annuities of certain officers and employees engaged in the enforcement of the criminal laws of the United States shall be computed on the basis of their average basic salaries for any five consecutive years of allowable service;

H. R. 3788. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Vermejo reclamation project, New Mexico;

H. R. 4097. An act for the relief of George M. Beesley, Edward D. Sexton, and Herman J. Williams;

H. R. 4138. An act for the relief of Herbert L. Hunter;

H. R. 4307. An act for the relief of Ever Ready Supply Co. and Harold A. Dahlberg;

H. R. 4366. An act for the relief of Pearson Remedy Co.;

H. R. 4854. An act for the relief of Mrs. Miriam G. Wornum;

H. R. 4948. An act relating to the policing of the building and grounds of the Supreme Court of the United States;

H. R. 5034. An act to authorize the taxation of Indian land holdings in the town of Lodge Grass, Mont., to assist in financing a municipal water supply and sewerage system;

H. R. 5114. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit the use of additional means, including stamp machines, for payment of tax on fermented malt liquors, provide for the establishment of brewery bottling house on brewery premises, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 5188. An act to provide for the preparation of a plan for the celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of the building of the Soo Locks.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, August 15, 1949, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

854. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental and deficiency estimates of appropriation for the fiscal year 1950 and prior



fiscal years in the amount of \$6,342,000 for the Post Office Department (H. Doc. No. 301); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

855. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1950 in the amount of \$7,500,000 for the General Services Administration (H. Doc. No. 302); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

856. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriation for the Judiciary in the amount of \$159,660, and proposed rescissions of appropriations for the District of Columbia in the amount of \$266,100, all for the fiscal year 1950 (H. Doc. No. 300); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

857. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a letter by the Acting Secretary of the Navy recommending the enactment of a proposed draft of legislation entitled "To Clarify the Status of Inactive Members of the Naval Reserve Relating to the Holding of Offices of Trust or Profit Under the Government of the United States"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

858. A letter from the Acting Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report of personnel ceilings as determined and fixed pursuant to Public Law 390, Seventy-ninth Congress, for the quarter ending June 30, 1949; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

859. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated July 18, 1949, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on Redondo Beach Harbor, Calif., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on April 17, 1939 (H. Doc. No. 303); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

860. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 28, 1949, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of waterway from Indian River inlet to Rehoboth Bay, Del., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved on March 2, 1945 (H. Doc. No. 304); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

861. A letter from the Secretary of the Army transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 24, 1949, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on a review of reports on Susquehanna River and tributaries, New York, Pennsylvania, and Maryland, with a view to improvement of Monkey Run Creek in Corning, N. Y., and vicinity, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, adopted on January 28, 1947 (H. Doc. No. 305); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with an illustration.

862. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 28, 1949, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of Pasquotank River, N. C., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on December 22, 1944 (H. Doc. No. 306); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with two illustrations.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 5764. A bill to authorize the granting to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., of rights-of-way on, over, under, through, and across certain public lands; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1260). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 5097. A bill for the administration of Indian livestock loans, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1261). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas: Committee of conference. H. R. 4177. A bill making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 1262.) Ordered to be printed.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 5973. A bill to provide additional compensation in lieu of overtime pay, for certain Federal employees engaged in criminal law-enforcement work; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 5974. A bill to prohibit an individual from traveling in interstate or foreign commerce in connection with the abandonment of his dependent child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 5975. A bill for the relief of Thomas Winkler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5976. A bill for the relief of Edit Hannah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCORMACK:

H. R. 5977. A bill for the relief of Leon Alex Piechowiak, alias Leon Piechowiak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H. R. 5978. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Michel Deval; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 5979. A bill for the relief of John Twelt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 5980. A bill for the relief of F. E. Thibodo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H. R. 5981. A bill for the relief of Clayborne V. Wagley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 5982. A bill for the relief of Livia de Badics and Agatha de Badics; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1408. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Fairbanks Chamber of Commerce, Fairbanks, Alaska, requesting Congress to take immediate steps to repeal the 15-percent excise tax on passenger travel and the 3-percent excise tax on freight shipments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1409. By Mr. LeCOMPTE: Petition of Messrs. Murdy and Johnston, druggists, and other citizens of Brooklyn, Iowa, urging the repeal of the 20-percent excise tax on all toilet goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## SENATE

MONDAY, AUGUST 15, 1949

(Legislative day of Thursday, June 2, 1949)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Douglas Frazer-Hurst, D. D., Elmwood Church, Belfast, Northern Ireland, offered the following prayer:

O, God, who art the author of life, the universal father, and yet hast given to every nation its place of habitation, and its own destiny; we pray for the people of this Republic, and for their representatives, met today in this council chamber. Guide us in all our deliberations so that we may feel ourselves supported by a higher wisdom than our own. Bless the President of the United States and the members of the Cabinet. In all our ways may we acknowledge Thee, so that Thou mayest direct our paths. Let us be willing to stand in the searchlight of truth, so that we may be honest and sincere in all our judgments. Deliver us from all selfishness and fear.

In these days of unsettlement, when clouds often gather darkly in the sky, may our hand be steady upon the helm which guides the ship of state. May we set our course by the stars of truth and justice, and not by the lesser lights of policy or passion. Help us to believe sincerely in the divine origin and destiny of man, and to resist any influences which would make him a chattel of the state, or deny him liberty of self-expression.

We pray Thee to bring together the English-speaking world in true brotherhood. With our common heritage of liberty and faith, may the things which unite us be always greater and stronger than the things which divide. As we are one in our belief in free institutions, in government of the people, by the people, and for the people, may we walk together in mutual trust and confidence on the great highway of freedom and service. We ask it in His name who is the Master of all good life, and the Inspirer of all true service, even Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Lucas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, August 12, 1949, was dispensed with.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 79) authorizing Federal participation in the International Exposition for the Bicentennial of the Founding of Port-au-Prince, Republic of Haiti, 1949.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the